Educ
C

THE

CANADIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. I.

FOR JANUARY, 1856.

528111
4-10-51

OUR MISSION.

The history of human progress presents a continuous conflict to realize a few truths, seen in the abstract, by an endless multiplicity of wrong agencies, and wrong methods of application. This is no where more conspicuous than in the diversified means employed to fit the young for the business of manhood. While, in the aggregate, there is a unanimity of purpose with regard to imparting in early life the precepts, the habits and professional talents that qualify the individual to perform creditably and profitably the duties of his earthly mission, and the teacher no less than the parent aspires zealously to mould youthful character into the desired conformation, there is still an acknowledged inadequacy of the means employed to the end sought to be attained, in the contrast between the actual man, who is the matured result of educational labor, and the ideal type which governs the successive stages of the educational process. And this disparity is not limited to isolated cases, to local causes or sectional influences; but is common to the human family, in all its forms of civilisation. Educational professions are much the same everywhere. They aim in all cases to make men what they should be, to improve the race and to benefit society. There is a solid stratum of goodness, a spark of the divine essence planted deeply and irrascibly in the being of every human creature that works for good, and, amid even the darkest nurturings of depravity, glimmers forth to show that there is a forlorn hope, notwithstanding that education and circumstances may have conspired to make the individual what he would not otherwise have been. So far there is no difference regarding the object to be accomplished, for the professions and intentions of both parents and teachers, under varying systems, unequivocally aim at the most benevolent results. But when, with a critical eye, we come to look at the practice and to examine the instrumentalities of education, the work seems a series of contradictions throughout most of its details. Both the teachers and the pupils appear the victims of a system or systems, at once arbitrary and irrational. The former hold on by a series of canonized formularies, to depart from which would be open heresy; while the latter are dragged, parrot like, through a course of committals and rehearsals of themes and learned phrases, the natural elements and structure of which they are not taught to understand. The memory is made paramount to the reason. Whatever is acquired is by rote. And this, as we have said, is not an exceptional practice; it is the general rule. And so one generation succeeds another; men grow up, enter life and perform their part on its busy theatre according to one set form; and when they quit, it is to make way for others who are prepared, by similar parental and scholastic instruction, to pass through the same undeviating routine, without questioning or knowing the rationale or ground of their inherited misconceptions.

If the disparity thus manifested betwixt the abstract truth and the practical result, is attributable to miscalculated means and to a misconception of the required conditions, it requires no great faculty of perception to indicate the course which ought to be pursued in order to make the means and the end harmonize. It becomes necessary, in short, to go back to first principles and to make use of a mathematical mode of procedure, in distinguishing between what should be rejected, as belonging to the old established regimen, and what, in the new series of suggestions, is worthy of adoption. By so doing we arrive, at once, at the fact that the most important errors and defects of the present mode of teaching lie at the very threshhold, when the child first enters on the rudiments of his native tongue; that they extend to the more advanced branches in the English department; and farther, that they make the study of foreign languages an affair of the greatest difficulty and, in most cases, altogether impracticable. These are grave reflections which, nevertheless, appear still more serious when they come to be minutely examined.

And the evil is not confined to the difficulty of acquiring even an imperfect acquaintance with native or foreign languages. It has of late years assumed a form pregnant with a latent and expressed desire and intention to circumscribe the department of ancient languages; if not, eventually, to suppress it altogether. The most recent indication of the popular mind, including the feeling among a respectable class of educationists connected

with the higher seminaries of learning in England and America, is to give the ancient languages a subordinate place in the scholastic curriculum. The tendency is to ignore the traditions and experiences of the past; not because they are not worth knowing, but because, in comparison with the present, the labor required for their study is Herculean and in most cases profitless. The crusade against what are called the dead languages must not, therefore, be supposed to have originated from a sense of their inutility; nor is the present excitement, in favor of limiting the branches of education to a knowledge, exclusively, of "common things," to be referred to a settled conviction that the latter are the most essential to the formation of national character. Such a supposition would be falacious. The public mind is sound, in so far as its appreciation, in an abstract sense, of the real value of holding fast by the knowledge of the ancient world, applies. The veneration for the past is an instinct that cannot be eradicated, however it may be obscured, for a time, by false reasoning or the exigencies of conflicting causes; and the prevalent disposition to depreciate the value of Greek and Latin especially, by persons who have not had the advantage of studying those languages or who have not been able to turn their study afterwards to any profitable account, is to be traced to the apparently insuperable difficulties and disgust attending the process of learning them. In the abstract, therefore, and in so far as the latent sentiment is an indication, the call for the teaching of "common things" is an imposed necessity. On the other hand, and with respect to the crusade itself, carried on to expel the ancient languages or, at least, to depreciate their value and importance, the threatened consequences appear rather alarming. Setting aside what has been done in England, partly a result of which has been the University Reform Commission; or in the United States where the teaching of Greek and Latin is becoming every day more subservient to the professional pecuniary demands of business men; we have had, within the last few years, in Canada, more particularly in Montreal and Toronto, various indications of a disposition to modify the old order of things so as to make our schools conform to the progressive materialism of the age. The claims of commerce and "English classics" have been ably set forth, and so also of a knowledge of "common things;" and in all cases this has been done, more or less to disparage the claims of the ancient tongues. What might be the result, in the course of a few years, if this disposition should receive no check, is too evident; for as modern progress is assumed to consist in the appliances of steam and the mechanical arts to the purposes of commerce, those branches of learning which, directly, contribute nothing to gratify the ruling commercial propensity would be sure to sink down to a state of merely nominal existence. And a change so fatal to the best interests of education would thus be brought about, not from a settled conviction, nor even a belief, that the ancient languages are less to be desired as a branch of education, but, simply, for the reason that an imperfect knowledge of them cannot be acquired without an expenditure of time, and money, and patience, altogether disproportioned to the advantages afterwards to be derived.

The *Canadian Quarterly Review* has been commenced chiefly with a design to explain a system of studying ancient and modern languages, in a way exceedingly simple, and at the same time critical. This announcement may excite incredulity, with many, who have had cognizance of the erroneous pretensions advanced by numerous publications, professing to teach without a master and mostly on, what is called, the Hamiltonian System; while others may imagine there is no short road possible, wherein to comprehend the endless rules and exceptions, common to the various methods of teaching those languages with which we are most familiar. A cursory examination, however, of the English or Latin Grammar is sufficient to satisfy any one that the rules are altogether arbitrary. This fact is itself sufficient to account for the difficulties with which the whole path of grammatical study is beset. It is the radical error of every grammar to be met with; and has been transmitted from time immemorial through successive generations, without having undergone any material modification. But, to understand the laws of language, it is necessary to go back to first principles. A merely imitative habit may be convenient, but cannot satisfy the reason, and therefore is unsatisfactory. Nothing short of a complete renunciation of the paraphernalia of substantives, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, &c., and a resort to the natural elements of speech, can ever explain the true theory. By taking this course we soon discover that mankind has but one grammar, one set of rules for all languages, simple in its conception, and admirably precise when applied in practice.

Hitherto it has been customary to assign great importance to the study of Latin, chiefly as a disciplinary exercise for the mind; and in the numerous treatises which have come under our notice, advocating its claims, we have often felt surprise that so much consequence should be attached to a supposed advantage of, really, so very little intrinsic value; while its main uses remained wholly unnoticed. We cannot, however, estimate too highly the advantages of Latin when we consider that it forms the principal element of the English language; and, till very recently, was the exclusive medium of correspondence, among the learned, throughout Europe; and, moreover, still constitutes the key to much that is requisite to be known in the history and institutions not only of the Romans, but also of the early Germanic tribes, and the civilization of the East. Greek, for similar reasons is indispensable to the English student; but the value of these two languages is still farther enhanced, by the circumstance, that in them are preserved the oldest manuscript copies of the Holy Scriptures.

As forming, however, to a large extent, the elements of English, it becomes, for this reason, impossible to understand, correctly, our native tongue without having first mastered both the Latin and Greek roots; and this being the case it naturally follows that the proper way to learn English is to commence its study, simultaneously with Latin and Greek, when children first enter their reading lessons. The practicability and advantages of this will be shown when we come to explain the method by which it can be done. In the mean time it behooves us to examine minutely and weigh well the considerations which make the study of the ancient tongues an imperative requirement.

The proper meanings of the simple words of a language, the processes of compounding and analyzing, and the rules for modifications of form and signification, valuable as they unquestionably are, constitute, by no means, the chief recommendations why they should be taught at an early age. Our estimate of the study of language would be low indeed if we measured it by no other criterion than its fitness to make men say precisely what they think and express their thoughts according to correct rules. But there is a more dignified object to be gained. A purpose more worthy of the labors of the teacher, more attractive to the aspiring genius of children and more befitting the intelligence of manhood. The teaching of any language, if rightly understood, is essentially a logical and mathematical process; and, therefore at the very threshhold of education, at almost the first lesson administered to a child, should commence a logical manner of speech and habit and thought. The formation of habit when the body and mind are maturing and gathering strength is the main point to be sought in every system of education; but to be effectual it must be commenced early, and must be carried on through its successive stages so that at every step the learner sees a rule and has a conviction that there is a reason for it, not dependent either on ignorance or caprice. Truth is an important ingredient in the satisfying of the reason; and with children and young persons nothing can be more fatal than to enforce precepts which are false, and lay down rules which, in practice, are contradictory. As one example of the little attention paid to these matters, let us take the division of the letters of the alphabet into vowels and consonants. The grammar published by direction of the Commissioners of Education for Ireland, and authorized by the Council of Public Instruction in Canada to be used in the Common Schools professes to be an improvement on both Murray and Lennie. Its definitions of those two classes of letters are as follows: "A Vowel is a letter which makes a distinct sound by itself. A Consonant is a letter which cannot be distinctly sounded without a vowel." Now the difference here stated between a vowel and consonant is in the distinctness of the sound; but if we take the right signification of the word "distinct," according to the Latin DIS (asunder), and TINGO (dye, stain, paint or mark) we perceive that each consonant is marked by a sound as separative from every other letter of the alphabet as each vowel is assumed to be. Again, the second definition makes the sound of a consonant more marked when in conjunction with a vowel than when sounded alone. This however is not the case, as we find by the combinations *ac*, *eb*, *ol*, *ni*, *ru*, wherein the sounds of the consonants preserve exactly the same marks, the same volume and the same power, without augmentation or diminution, which they possess when expressed separately. The distinction intended, by the Latins, between a vowel and a consonant seems, evidently, to have been a sound expressed alone, and a sound expressed in conjunction with another sound. A vowel, from the Latin VOCALIS (one sound), and CON (together), with SONANS (sounding), equivalent to *sounding together*, bears out this interpretation; so that the Latin definitions contained in the signification and structure of the words "vowel" and "consonant" should have been preserved so long as the words themselves continued to be used. Following now the course indicated by the Latin significations, we discover that the vowels may be sounded by themselves, but that the consonants never should. For example, in the primary book of lessons, the child should be taught to express *a*, *e*, *o*, separately; but the combinations *ab*, *el*, *oc*, should each be expressed without any division of the letters, and in such a way as to give to each combination only one sound: The rule being that a consonant is not to be sounded alone. The practice, however, has been the reverse of this; and it is a melancholy fact that, at the very entrance of children to the school room, the first lesson they receive is to say the letters of the alphabet in a way exceedingly erroneous. However this is only one specimen of the treatment received by the juvenile mind at an age when it is most susceptible of being impressed and when impressions take the firmest hold, for good or for evil in after life. But it stands not alone; for, so far as the definitions and nomenclature are concerned, similar errors are visible in almost every lesson of our most approved grammars, in addition to the arbitrary character of their rules; illustrations of which will be given in a separate chapter.

With such a method of early mental discipline it need create no surprise that, among our best writers, incongruities of style and diction prevail to an extent hardly credible. There is now lying before us the report of a speech delivered, on a recent occasion, in England, by an illustrious personage of acknowledged scholastic reputation, in which occurs, among other errors, the expression "scientific knowledge." It is an expression often met with and, lately, appeared no less than three times in a prospectus of a proposed college to be established in our neighboring city Hamilton. It is adduced here as an example, along with others which follow, of the consequence of the present mode of teaching, and the necessity which exists for the adoption of an analytical

process in the study of the English Language. "Scientific knowledge," according to correct definition, signifies *knowledge made knowledge*, which in sense is absurd. The Latin and Greek forms, from which the English words are derived, are SCIENTIA (knowledge) FACIO (make); and γνωμολογια* (knowledge), the original form from which the English word is derived. "Empirical experiences" is another expression employed by an able writer in one of the British Quarterly Reviews. Both words are from the Greek; *em* and *ex* at the commencement of each being εν (in) εκ or εξ (out); and the remainder of each word is from πειραω (try). So that the English reading of the expression "empirical experiences" is, properly, *tried in tried out things*; an evident contradiction of terms. "Practical experience," another erroneous combination, is more common than either of the former. "Episcopal bishop" is of more rare occurrence. Both words here are from the same Greek word επισκοπος a compound of επι (over) and σκοπος (a watcher, spyer or looker). The form "bishop," *bi* for επι and *shop* for σκοπος, comes to us through the German and Danish. One more example of this method of combining words is "erroneous orthography," wherein the contradiction is complete; as will be seen by the analysis of the last word, *ortho* from ὀρθὸς (right) and *graphy* from γραφω (grave, scrape or write). The most frequent errors in English composition, however, are to be found in such expressions as "introduced into," "entered into," "inquired into," where *in* appears twice; "accede to," "accompanied to," "accessory to," in which *to* occurs also in the compounds, *ac* being the Latin form of *to*; "if I were," "if he should," wherein *if* gives each expression the character of a postulate, and, therefore, should be accompanied by no other conditional terms; "is being prepared," "are being considered," which are intended for passive forms of the action, but are in reality inadmissible forms of the passive state of being. These specimens of some of the modes in which English is commonly written are produced here to show, as we have already stated, one of the uses of making foreign languages, and more particularly the Latin and Greek, what may be called stepping stones to the acquisition of good English.

Another use, no less important, is to be able to read foreign books in the language of the writers. Translations into English, in the way translations are made, generally convey other sentiments than those intended by the authors of the originals. A translator may be careless, may be inefficient or may be biased, and one or other of many accidents, such as these, often operates to spoil, in the translation, a valuable foreign book. And now we come to the reading of the New Testament in Greek and Latin. If these languages are serviceable to the English scholar, for the purpose of enabling him to understand his native tongue; they are no less so, as a key to the primitive forms in which the Scriptures appeared. The force of this remark is more impressive when we consider how many constructions are put on certain passages, many of them contradictory; how many objections are stated against the correctness of the English authorized version; and how much religious dissention exists among Christian bodies, arising often, in great measure, from the want of a definite standard by which to test the validity of opposite interpretations of the text. Moreover, there is at present, in the United States, a society, known as the American Bible Union, preparing a new version of the New Testament. This society consists of a respectable body of clergymen of various denominations. They profess dissatisfaction with the version in common use, and propose to furnish the English reader with something that will contain none of the objectionable interpretations of which they complain. But what guarantee has the English reader, who has no acquaintance with Greek or Latin, that the members composing the American Bible Union are more competent to accomplish the task they have undertaken, than were the editors of the present authorized version? Or how is he to know that the work, when completed, may not have been shaped so as to favor particular denominational tenets? The new version may have as many faults as the old; it may be objectionable to those who are competent to subject it to a critical examination; or it may contain alterations so few and so insignificant, as to create a feeling of regret that the general esteem for the authorized version at present in use should have been unnecessarily disturbed. All these are contingencies, to be looked at now, and to excite in the mind of merely English scholars some degree of anxiety and uneasiness. There is however a remedy; and here, more than in any other case, the use of the ancient languages, and the propriety of popularizing their use become at once conspicuous.

An additional consideration is the benefit to be derived from holding fast to the wisdom of the ancient world. The prevailing taste in America is to foster, on the contrary, whatever ministers to the actual or immediate wants of the individual, whatever is conducive to bodily comfort, to frivolous personal enjoyment and the accumulation of material wealth. All is trade and commerce. There is no halting, for the purpose of looking back to contrast what is, with what has passed away. There is no resting place for the refreshment of the worn out sensualist and worldly devotee. The past has got no charms for American citizenship. And all this absence of a relish for the teachings of former times, proceeds from there being no available common language, in general use, by which this object so desirable could be achieved. But the loss, in a national sense cannot be estimated, because we are ignorant of the value of what

* The reading of the New Testament in the original Greek being one of the chief objects of the *Canadian Quarterly Review*, the Greek alphabet is printed on the last page of this number, for the use of those who have no knowledge of the language, but who may have a desire to avail themselves of the opportunity, now offered, to become acquainted with it.

we are incapable of comprehending. Nationally, we know nothing of the first mental struggles of the Ionian and Eleatic schools to arrive at first principles. Yet where is human wisdom that can compare with the results of their earnest cogitations, or what more instructive than the example of their intellectual activity. First principles, they discovered, and have recorded in their writings, which are transmitted to the age in which we live, though few of us know any thing of them. Yet they contain the teachings which are mostly required, and without which society in America, as elsewhere, must continue a conglomeration of contrary impulses, misunderstood by those who rule, and mysterious to the masses who are the victims of bad government. If we wish to be an educated, orderly and intellectual people we must go back and learn the necessary conditions from Heraclitus and Anaximander and Anaxagoras and Xenophanes and Parmenides and the other members of the Pre-Socratic division, down to the time of Plato and Aristotle. We must learn from them the nature of the real and phenomenal; the sensuous perception and rational cognition; truth and its semblance; and those general first principles which unfold the essential attributes of mind and matter, the oneness of all things, and the perpetual and unceasing antagonism of the natural forces, out of which comes all good. True progress consists in a union of the sensuous with the suprasensuous. Good cannot come out of extremes. It is the fruit of final compromises only, after the oscillations of opinion and passion have subsided, and after the agitating principles of intellect have expended their force in opposite directions. As little can the material appliances of the present day produce, by their unaided operation, the state of society which our best efforts are directed to realize, as the Greek learning of itself was inadequate in the best periods of Greek history to do more than exhibit a brilliant mental light in the midst of the darkest heathenism. The material we ought to regard as only one object and one means in the work of social amelioration. The intellectual, another. Commerce and philosophy have not, however, co-operated. The modern and the ancient, steam power and abstract truth, are as unknown to each other and as far separated, in a practical sense, as if it had been designed from the beginning that they should be so. Shall our schools, then, continue to be the nursery of one exclusive kind of knowledge? Shall nothing be taught but what has a pecuniary value in the business transactions of the world? Are the minds of our youth to be stored with a heterogeneous assemblage of common visible facts, having no arrangement or connection, and the reason to remain uncultivated? These are questions over which all practical educationists will do well to ponder, who regard education as a process not only for forming right personal habits, but also for training the mind to think and how to reason aright.

We have already stated, in the course of these remarks, that the logical habit should commence and be impressed on children when they begin to learn the alphabet. They should not, as at present, be taught one lesson in one way, and afterwards be taught another that contradicts the first. They should have no arbitrary rules presented to them: for there is, then, as much trouble unlearning or fruitlessly trying to reconcile previous contradictions as in attending to the actual lesson of the day. The facilities are great for inculcating the logical process, in the teaching of English, when the right method is understood. It is more so still when two or three languages having a marked relationship are taught together. We consider this one of the chief advantages of the system which we are about to explain, that several languages can be taught simultaneously, and at the same time as easily and more profitably than one; while the mathematical method of reasoning, in consequence of the rules being definite, is strictly observed. More than this, we promise those who have passed the school age and are actively engaged in the necessary avocations of trade, that by means of the few simple rules and illustrations which shall appear in the pages of this *Review*, they may in a short period master the Greek and Latin versions of the New Testament, not only to read the text fluently but also according to strictly critical rules.

In conclusion, the work assigned to the *Canadian Quarterly Review* is to explain the theory and practice of the English and other languages, according to the fixed natural laws to which all languages, less or more, conform; to impart a critical acquaintance with those languages from which the English is derived, so as to be able to understand our native tongue; to set forth a method of cultivating the reason and the heart, at the proper season, instead of instructing the intellect with frivolous subjects of observation that belong properly to an after period of life; to familiarize and make popular the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the Greek and Latin languages; and while exercising criticism on the more prominent topics of the day, whether of education, government, or literature, to do so, in accordance with the method of thinking and acting according to first principles, which is more especially the object we profess to have in view and desire to inculcate.

New Classification of Words and New Nomenclature.

The first difficulty met with in learning the rules of a language, in the way languages have been hitherto taught, is the classification of words according to a practice that has no reason by which it can be justified, and the naming of each class by a word that conveys not the meaning intended. No person who has been drilled in the nine parts of speech can fail to perceive the want of correspondence between the divisional arrangement and the functions of the parts. While an article and

an adjective are put under different heads, as belonging to different classes, they perform, nevertheless, one and the same function. The other parts are divided and designated, in a manner equally arbitrary, and without reference to the natural structure. This being the case it becomes imperative, before proceeding to the exposition of our system of teaching to examine the classification and nomenclature at present in use, and show wherein they are erroneous, and consequently the propriety of making a change so as to fit them to the requirements of a better method. The alteration of rules that have been practiced and exclusively followed through many ages, since language first took a systematic shape, is not to be undertaken without very cogent reasons; and nothing less than the most satisfactory explanation for the necessity of such change would justify its adoption. But when it can be shown that an institution, notwithstanding its having had the sanction of a long and approved usage, is radically wrong; that its rules, its definitions, its nomenclature and in short its entire structure is false, surely there can be no scruple about the propriety of modifying it, particularly when the reason for doing so is unquestionable and conclusive.

We set out by making it a rule that every word must correspond, in signification with the function which it is intended and professes to represent. This is a rule that must be kept in sight throughout the definitions, the classification of words, the nomenclature, and the whole series of modifications which words undergo in order to adapt them to varied modes of expression. In no case should it be forgotten that words are the outward expressions of ideas. Whatever passes in the mind of a person is communicated to others by these outward symbols. They ought therefore to carry the significations of the ideas which are in the mind; neither adding to, taking from, nor distorting their actual conformations. The more a language approaches to an observance of this rule, the more perfect it becomes and the better suited to answer the purpose for which it is designed. It must be confessed, however, that, neither by the popular writer of the day, nor by the more accomplished scholar who looks forward to a posthumous fame, is this rule much respected. An example of this has been brought under our notice, by the proceedings connected with the opening lecture of the professorship of useful arts in the Edinburgh University. The incumbent stated that Technology, the name by which the new Chair is designated, though not expressing what was intended by the founders, was selected because there was no more appropriate word in the English language. No question appears to have arisen about the propriety of taking two simple words and by their combination forming a word that would convey the signification—*useful arts*. What appears to have been desired is a Greek name; either a Greek simple or compound word. But if, after searching the lexicon, no such word could be found, why not have taken two simple Greek words, the one signifying *useful* and the other *arts*, and, by putting them together, have made a compound word such as was required? There is no valid reason why this should not have been done. On the other hand, failing the adoption of one proper course, such as we have here pointed out, a second was available. The plain and appropriate title—Faculty of Useful Arts, though in English, would have been rational and would not have violated our sense of what, we conceive, is the abstract rule to which language ought strictly to conform. One or other of these two courses should have been followed; and on no account should a name have been adopted which means something else or something more than is comprised within the sphere of the new professorship. It is no more necessary to enter here a special defence for the liberty of forming new compounds from simple words, according to acknowledged rules, than it would be to defend the right to destroy special verbal forms of combination when opposed to general principles; for the tenor of our remarks and the illustrations with which they shall be accompanied will, we have no doubt, sufficiently establish the right to do both. Technology, like most other words, from the Greek, employed to designate the several branches of science, is a compound of two simple Greek words. No reason can be adduced why similar compounds should not be made now, as they were, in times long gone past, to meet similar exigencies. Usage, no doubt, is itself a law; but usage admits of modification. It is not immutably fixed, and therefore cannot be pleaded, against the propriety of these new verbal arrangements. In this, however, as in similar cases wherein rules are questioned, it is best to go back to first principles.

Chemistry owes its astonishing progress during the last twenty years to the observance of mathematical precision in the language as well as in the experiments of the laboratory. The law of definite proportions and equivalents, without which it must have remained comparatively stationary, has given a shape, has, in fact, defined the exact process through which every proposition must pass in order to be tested. Had the same care been taken to ascertain and limit the exact mode of procedure to be followed in the composition and analysis of verbal signs, such an error as that committed by the Edinburgh University could not have occurred. It is not, however, too late to go back to first principles, and, if we choose to profit by the chemical method, the task will be found less difficult.

Words, like chemical substances, are capable of combination or disposition. Simple words when combined preserve their individual significations, and when translated from one language to another should carry with them the significations of the original. For example, if it is required to find a compound word, in one language,

that will convey a particular meaning from a compound word of another, the simple equivalents must be sought after first; thus, for the Latin PROVIDEO we have the English *fore*, which is equal to PRO, and *see* which is equal to VIDEO; making *foresee* equal to PROVIDEO, because equals added to equals the products are equal. Or the statement may be made in another form, more concise; thus:

PRO=fore, VIDEO=see, therefore PROVIDEO=foresee.

By this method exact equivalents may be ascertained in many languages, and for the purpose of translation it furnishes the only sure test of correctness. Let us now apply it to find the equivalents for these same simples and compounds also in German and Greek.

προς=PRO=vor=*fore*
εἴδω=VIDEO=sehe=*see*.
Therefore προ+εἴδω=PROVIDEO=vorsehe=*foresee*.

In verbatim translations the simple equivalents should stand in perpendicular columns, in the following manner:

προς	εἴδω
PRO	VIDEO
vor	sehe
fore	*see*.

If, in accordance with this method, we now look for a word in Greek to correspond with what is meant, in English, by *arts that are of use*, we find τέχνη (art) and ὠφελεια (utility), the combining of which gives us the word τέχνωφέλεια, or, in English, *technophely*. Following the analogy of the Greek, in compound words of this nature, *technophely* (utilitarian art) is the proper designation for a professorship of the useful arts. True, there is no compound form of τέχνη and ὠφελεια in the Greek lexicon. Such a compound may not have been required by the early Greeks, otherwise it might have been formed, as τεχνουργια (a work of art), from τεχνη and εργον (work); or, as τεχνολογια, from τεχνη and λόγος (word or saying).

The point for which we here contend is the necessity of constant correspondence between the words used and the ideas or notions or things which are intended to be represented by them. The correspondence must be faithfully rendered so that the representative words shall convey nothing more and nothing less than is comprised in the archetypes. This is a point which cannot be too forcibly pressed on the attention of the student, for the errors, innumerable, arising from its not being observed or not attended, produce serious consequences both in a speculative and practical sense on the ordinary affairs of life. Indeed, it may safely be said, that false modes of thinking and reasoning, and consequently wrong judgments and wrong conduct, originate in an indefinite and arbitrary use of the verbal symbols with which the mind operates. To say that Technology is a *speaking about art*, is perfectly correct; for this is the signification originally intended. The error of making that word stand for something else becomes more readily perceived when we apply the rule. Had it been necessary to express the phrase *useful arts*, in the way now required, the Greek writers would certainly not have employed the word Technology. According to their custom they would have searched for the necessary simple equivalents, and from these would have compounded a word to answer the purpose. The reflection now is, why the course which they usually adopted is not followed when circumstances, which are changed, require new names for new combinations of ideas. If the word Technology is to be retained we shall then have, in one of our principal institutions of learning, the permanent violation of one of the first rules to be observed in the teaching of youth; and in the course of time, or of a few years, when the regrets of the present University incumbents, concerning the want of a more appropriate designation, shall be forgotten, the absurdity τέχνη + λογος = *useful* + *arts* will remain as a mark to disparage the character of a noble institution. The error committed by the Edinburgh University will, however, occasion less surprise when we find it pervading every page of our best dictionaries. Webster makes *conduce=lead*, *condition=build or make*, *condite=prepare* or *preserve*; rendering in each of the two first examples a compound equal to a simple; and, in the last, a compound of two elements equivalent to two other compounds whose elementary parts are altogether of a different character, with different significations. The application of the rule will explain this more clearly:

con+duce=lead.	con+dite=pre+pare.
con+dit+ion=build or make.	con+dite=pre+serve.

Here *lead*, a simple element, can be equal to only one of the two simple elements of *conduce*. *Lead* or its equivalent *duce* is therefore only a part of the compound. And according to the mathematical axiom that the whole is greater than a part, *conduce* cannot be the equivalent of *lead*. Each of the other three examples may be tested in the same way, and be found to exhibit still more erroneous results; as the disparity is greater when the components, of what is assumed as one equivalent, increase in number, as *con+dit+ion=build*; or when none of the components of one assumed compound equivalent, such as *con+dite*, resembles any element of the compound with which it is said to be synonymous, such as *pre+serve*; for neither *con* nor *dite* carries a signification to equal *pre* or *serve*.

We are more particular on this point because the practice of translating simple words, by compounds, or, by words of a different meaning, is one of most common occurrence. Eminent writers follow a bad precedent, and imitate each other from habit. It is the system of teaching that is at fault in all this. The mind receives a wrong bias in the mode by which it begins to compound and analyze simple things. It is warped on its first entrance to the study of sounds and letters; and throughout life it acts on the impressions, thus received at an early age. But in order to illustrate the extent

to which this practice is carried, in more advanced departments of teaching, the best course will be to take a grammar that is in general use and subject it to a critical examination. Any of the popular school grammars would answer this purpose; Murray's, Webster's, Lennie's or Adams' Latin Grammar; for they are similarly constructed, with scarcely a perceptible variation. That published by authority of the Commissioners of National Education for Ireland is, however, considered preferable to any of these, for our present purpose, because it professes to be an improvement, in several respects, on any of the school grammars previously published; and, furthermore, because it is authorized by the Council of Public Instruction in Upper Canada. The first sentence in the grammar here selected for examination is the following: "Mankind communicate their thoughts by spoken and written language." Here, it will be observed, "Mankind" is in the singular number, and consequently the two words following should also be in the singular. The reason why "Mankind" is singular, is its reference to a single species; the species man in contradistinction to the other species of the animal creation. Being, therefore, singular, the proper form would have been this: *Mankind communicates its thoughts.* The error, here noticed, is, however, authorized by the rule common to all English Grammars, that "When a noun of multitude conveys plurality of idea, the verb and pronoun should be plural." "Mankind" is supposed to convey plurality of idea, but a slight inspection of the structure of the word is sufficient to show that this is not the fact. The individuality or plurality depends on the last simple word "kind." We speak of *one kind* or of *two kinds*; and say one kind of men or two kinds of animals, to all which forms of the singular or plural other relative words have to conform. *One kind of men* conveys plurality of idea much more than "Mankind;" yet, as a theme, it is singular. But neither "Man" nor "kind" when isolated can be considered plural. With reference to the human race, as a plurality of units, we still say *man is*, not *man are.* If the rule referred to is right what becomes, then, of the first rule, in the Syntax of every English grammar, that "A verb must agree with its nominative in number and person?" The English structure should agree with that of the languages from which English is derived, in this particular. In these the singular and plural are determined by the terminations of the words. This is generally the rule in English, except in words that have the same form in both singular and plural numbers. Least of all should a word, that has the singular and plural terminations different, be made to act, in the singular, as if that singular was a plural number. As we stated in the outset, words must correspond with their functions. If they are to perform a function in the singular they ought to have a singular form and if a plural function, then a form in the plural. But words must also correspond with the ideas which they are intended to represent. Unity of idea should likewise have a word in the singular, and plurality of idea should be represented by a plural word. Nevertheless, what is more common among our public writers, than such expressions as, "the Government are," "the Ministry are," "the committee are," "the congregation are." Expressions which are opposed by the analogy of other languages; and therefore should be discarded from the English as a vulgar idiom.

But to return to the example, "Mankind communicate their thoughts by spoken and written language," we must also mark the error of the latter part of the sentence. The word language, from the Latin LINGUA (the tongue) signifies *speech*; and, therefore, the two words language and speech being synonymous, it is no more admissible to say "spoken language" than it is to say "statistical tables" or "episcopal bishop;" the erroneousness of which latter phrase we have already explained. But the errors, in this first example, from the Grammar which we are criticising, end not here. The expression "written language" which closes the sentence is a contradiction of terms; as "written" denotes whatever is expressed by the pen, and "language" whatever, on the contrary, is expressed by the tongue. The two words indicate two very different modes of expression, and, therefore, to use them together, the one to qualify the other, in the way here exemplified, is not only a contradiction but is also nonsensical.

The first definition of this Grammar is the following: "The elements of spoken language are articulate sounds." Now "articulate" signifies to join; but what joining is there in the character of a simple sound? Each sound, as an element, is independent of every other; necessarily so, or it would cease to be elementary. It is only when joined with another sound that the articulation takes place. Adams says, in like manner, "A letter is the mark of a sound or of an articulation of sound," showing that the notion entertained, by our grammatical authorities, of the function of a simple sound or letter is to articulate, to join or put together; or, if this is not the office which these sounds or letters are intended to perform, that those authorities have expressed in their definitions what they had no intention of expressing. The proper definitions are the following: *The elements of language are simple sounds: The elements of grammar are letters.*

In the definition of *grammar* is an error of common occurrence, occasioned by neglecting the very marked distinction between art and science. "Grammar is that science" is a wrong expression, because "Grammar" is properly an art; it is practical; it is the act or habitual practice of putting letters, words and sentences together for the purpose of giving utterance to our thoughts.

The other definitions are much of the same character. But we pass on to what are called the parts of speech.

These are divided under nine separate heads, namely, Article, noun, adjective, pronoun, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection. The first is defined thus:—"An article is a word placed before a noun to limit its signification; as, *a* tree, *an* apple, *the* garden" Now a class ought to include all words functioning in the same way, otherwise the divisional arrangement is not correct. Here only two words are admitted under the head "Article." But there are other words besides, such as *two, three, some, few, many*, employed to limit the principal words before which they are placed, and which are equally entitled to be classed under that head. If, therefore, "a tree" is an example of the limitation of one word by the precedence of another, so are *two trees, some apples, many gardens*, examples also, strictly within the scope of the definition. Again: "An Adjective is a word which qualifies a noun; as, a *sweet* apple, a *large* garden, a *new* book." But, according to the illustrations, under the two separate heads, there is no difference between an adjective and an article, except in the designations. And the expression *an apple* or *two apples* might, with as much propriety be applied to illustrate the function of the adjective as the terms in the examples given; and in like manner, might "large garden" be made illustrative of limitation under the head "Article." The designation "Adjective," besides, is not appropriate. Neither is "Article" a proper word. As in most other examples, the name furnishes no indication of the function of a class of words.

The principal word of a sentence is, thus, defined: "A Noun is the name of a person, place or thing; as, John, London, book." The word *noun* or Latin NOMEN is synonymous with the English word *name*, so that the definition is equivalent to saying *a name is the name of a person, place or thing*. The same error occurs in the definition of what is called a Verb; thus: "A Verb is a word which affirms," &c. Now "Verb" from Latin VERBUM signifies *word*. The definition, therefore, is tantamount to—*a word is a word that affirms, &c.*

We have noticed the definitions and classification so far for the purpose of showing the extent to which they are inapplicable; and also, with the view, of justifying an alteration of that part of the nomenclature which defines the different species of words, as well as to recommend the adoption of a new arrangement for their classification.

According to the early Greek and Latin writers, the proper division of words is into three classes; a division which we mean to adopt here. Indeed, looking back to the original structure of language, and more particularly of the Eastern tongues, there is much to admire in the simplicity and regularity with which all the parts are found to correspond. Notwithstanding our respect for such a high authority as Franz Bopp, it is to be regretted, we think, that he should, in his Sanscrit Grammar, have assigned eight parts to the division of Sanscrit words. This division not only has no correspondence with the analogies of the languages of the East, But Bopp's illustrations are not satisfactory, as they fail, in establishing the classification which he has adopted. The division of words into three classes is, however, sustained by their natural relations and by reason, as well as by the sanction of antiquity; the truth of which will be seen and fully established when we come to treat of the structure of simple and compound sentences. In the meantime we lay down the following three heads, under which all the words of a language should be arranged.

1.—All words capable of a themic application are, by virtue of this, the most important function, called Principals. 2.—All words that explain something of the principals are named Expletives. 3.—All remaining words go under the name of Conjunctions. This is the natural division, which we shall here explain more fully.

Principals, as we have said, are those words which can be employed as themes, in the construction of sentences; thus, *God* created the earth, the *earth* was created by God, *I* was created, *who* is created. Here, however, are two kinds of principals. First, *God, earth*, and *I* are Absolute Principals. And in the second place, *who* is a Parenthetical Principal. There are, therefore, two kinds of principal words; both of which are capable of the themic function in the structure of sentences. The particular functional character being that which distinguishes them as a separate class.

Expletives are termed so because their function is to explain something of the principals. There are two kinds of expletives. Those derived from principal words; as, *good* from *goodness*. And those derived from predicative conjunctions, which are explained in the next paragraph; as *threatening* and *threatened*, from *to threaten*. We say a *good* friend, a *threatening* letter, and the *threatened* consequences. Besides these two kinds of expletives, each of the three classes of principals has two expletive forms. One form when it comes before the principal; as, *John's* book, *his* book, *whose* book; and a different form when it comes after it; as, the book *of John*, the book *of him*, the book *of whom*.

Conjunctions, as the name denotes, join sentences and parts of sentences together. They are three in number. 1.—The Sentential Conjunction simply joins sentences, as, John *and* James went to London; which is a compound sentence, compounded of the two simple sentences, John went to London, and, James went to London. The sign of the sentential conjunction in the above example is *and*. 2.—The Predicative Conjunction joins the theme to the predicate; as, God *created* the earth; in which *God* is the theme, and *created the earth* is the predicate; *created* being the predicative conjunction. The word *predicative* from Latin PRO (forth) and the root of DICO (I say) is equivalent to *say forth*. So that a predicative conjunction is a word which joins and, at the same time, says forth or ex-

presses action, as *strike*,—possession, as *have*,—or being, as *am*. 3.—The Accidental Conjunction joins the accidence to the theme and prodicate; as, in the example, the earth was created *by God*; wherein *the earth* is the theme, *was created* is the prodicate, and *by God* is the accidence; *by* being the accidental conjunction.

Or, expressed according to the following arrangement, will exhibit a more compact view of the whole classification:

1.—Principal:

1.—Absolute; as, *John, book, virtue, I, you, it.*
2.—Parenthetical; as, *who, which, what.*

2.—Expletive:

1.—Forms of the Principal; as, *good, virtuous, John's,* or *of John, his* or *of him, whose* or *of whom.*
2—Forms of the Prodicative Conjunction; as, *threatening, threatened.*

3.—Conjunction:

1.—Sentential; as, *and, or, nor.*
2.—Prodicative; as, *create, loved.*
3.—Accidental; as, *to, from, in, through, by, under, but, however, thus.*

This new nomenclature and classification, are the result of a process of generalisation, concerning the natural structure of those languages with which most scholars have some acquaintance; as well as of others that are less known. In our next chapter, on the structure of sentences and their connection, which will appear in the second number of the *Canadian Quarterly Review*, we will illustrate how languages, without an exception, conform to it; and how all languages have but one set of rules, simple and mathematically defined.

Law of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, by the Roman Catholic Bishops, and the Chief Superintendent of Schools: being the first part of correspondence ordered to be printed by the Legislative Assembly.—1855.

The Common School System, its Principle, Operation and Results.—By Angus Dallas, Toronto, 1855.

Like most other subjects that affect the conscientious scruples of individuals and societies, education has become a source of discord; furnishing a deplorable example of the consequences that proceed from a non-observance of the principles of civil and religious liberty. Why people should quarrel, about modes of faith, any more than about modes of dress, appears, on calm reflection, one of those anomalies which are readily perceived, but difficult of solution. That, at certain periods of history, the civil and ecclesiastical laws should have ordained uniformity of belief is perfectly reconcilable with the circumstances of the early patriarchal and less civilized condition of nations. And in this respect we admire the wisdom of Moses in restraining the Israelites from seeking after false gods; and appreciate the policy of the various ecclesiastical forms of Church government since the first organisation of the great papal hierarchy of Rome. Different states of society require different systems of civil and religious government. The Jewish ceremonial law would be no more applicable under the christian dispensation, than the civil laws of China to the circumstances of Canadian Society. For different circumstances necessitate different institutions. A truth so palpable should lead us to respect the motives which, in different periods of the world, dictated social arrangements that, however inapplicable to the age in which we live, were adapted to times in which rude habits and feudal customs could not otherwise have been controlled; and should incline us to deal charitably and in a spirit of toleration with those who, differing from us in their religious views, continue conscientiously to cling to traditional observances long after the occasion of the utility of those observances may be supposed, by us, to have passed away. Civil and religious liberty is a plant of modern growth, called into being by the advancement of commerce and the increase of municipal corporations. It concedes the right of every person to think, and also, to act in a way contrary to that of every other person, provided the actions so permitted do not militate against the interests and general well being of the community. Regarded in its proper spirit, it is a compromise between antagonistic and extreme views, wherein each individual and each section of a people, after having by turns attained dominancy and by turns had to succumb to the alternate usurpations of each other, finally agree to concede and mutually to guarantee the unmolested exercise of each others peculiar sectional claims and pretensions. Civil and religious liberty must not be regarded as a voluntary creation,—the result of choice. It is the product of long continued and violent struggles; after contending parties have alternately conquered and been conquered; and, after becoming exhausted and having their force entirely spent, they have wisely calculated the natural penalty which each has had to pay. History is read with little profit if such a lesson as this is neglected. The Roman Catholic and Protestant, and the Presbyterian and Protestant Episcopalian wars were for a long period carried on, in Germany, France, England, Scotland and Ireland, on the principle of extermination. The rancour with which the combatants were animated and the horrid cruelties attending the work in which they were engaged, continued, with the belief that the ultimate predominance and acknowledged supremacy of one or other party would be followed by religious uniformity as a necessary condition of such predominance. In accordance with this belief coercive measures were resorted to, whenever predominance was attained, for the purpose of suppressing on the one hand, heresy; and on the other, popery. That these coercive measures were ineffectual is recorded in the histories of each of these countries; and not only were they ineffectual but they roused a spirit of resistance that, in all cases, gathered strength sufficient to reflect its consequences on the active instruments in these religious persecutions, The times, when these tragedies were performed, are past; the ends which, by an inscrutable Providence, they were designed to serve, have been accomplished; and we now enjoy the conviction, derived from the dissentions of our predecessors, that intolerance, in matters of faith and opinion, however conscientiously practiced, is attended invariably by profitless disturbances that have a permanent and widely spread influence on the whole framework of society. Civil and religious freedom being, thus, the necessitated result of dearly bought experience is a treasure which we cannot too highly prize, when we measure the cost at which it has been purchased. Nor do we feel disposed, at this advanced stage of our Provincial history, to yield one inch of ground to any attempt at a violation of the principle it involves.

The spectacle in Canada, at the present day is a contest to decide whether education is a work partly religious or exclusively secular. In a population numbering over 2,300,000 souls, divided in opinion and practice on the momentous questions of Christian doctrine, it might be supposed, these very divisions would dictate the justice and policy, on the part of the Government, of exercising the largest share of forbearance when dealing with measures that interfere directly with people's religious convictions. This, however, is very far from being the case; and the question arises: Why so much opposition should be offered to the connection between Church and State, and, on the other hand, so many efforts to defend the union of the State with the School? For if education *is believed* by more than one half of the population to be partly a religious work, this belief itself, because it involves religious scruples, should bar the right of interference, on the part of the Government as effectually as on a question of patronage to only one particular denomination of Christians. The principle involved is the same in both cases. We will not enter here on proof of the fact that education is partly a work of religion, and that denominational doctrines and catechisms are as necessary in the School as in the Church. It is sufficient for our argument that more than one half the population of Canada believes it to be so; and desires to have religious and secular instruction carried on simultaneously during the same school hours. With the peculiar notions and fancies of individuals Government should in no way be identified, more particularly when those notions are opposed to the matured experience and example of nations best capable of judging. Had the practice of England, France, Belgium, Holland or Germany been consulted, the fact would have been seen, that education is, in these countries, a religious work; and farther, that, in the four last named, the teaching of peculiar religious doctrines and creeds is not proscribed but, on the contrary, is encouraged in the common schools; all religious denominations having equal privileges, and being, in so far as schools are concerned, equally under the fostering care of the respective governments; separate religious instruction being the exception to the rule, and a necessary provision, when the schools happen to be of a mixed character. In a European point of view, a nation is an aggregate of sects. Christianity is not there recognisable except in its sectarian forms; it being a point long since settled by the unanimous decision of the best authorities that the total renunciation of all the distinctive marks by which the visible Christian Church is distinguished is nothing less than Deism; however it may be disguised under an assumed name. A government composed of the legislative and executive departments, is accordingly there regarded as an aggregate of sectarian elements, the representatives of all forms of public sentiment. We here quote from the able work of M. P. Dumont, which took the first prize in 1840:

"France has not proclaimed a State religion, which would have been falsehood, under a form of Government of which the great bodies of the State are the direct representatives of public opinion; but it has secured protection and assistance to all forms of Christian worship, and so, in this respect, it has considered itself in the right. It has proved to the eyes of the world that Christian beliefs, without exception of Church or Sect, are those of the French nation. France after having declared itself Christian in the Charter, after having verified as an important fact, that the Catholic religion is professed by the majority of the French people, at setting out, caunot, without inconsistency, forget that point when it takes in hand to organize the public education. When it founds establishments which affect the moral education of the young it cannot forget the moral principle which it affirms itself; but it forgets not that it is tolerant and that it loves, above all, liberty of conscience. All Christian communions will find, then, in its public establishments of education the hospitable reception which in the Charter, it has promised to them. We love to see that, in its eyes, all Christian Sects are sisters, and that, in the administration of the great family, it accords to them the same solicitude. Although with men who wish to bring up their children in the systematic contempt of all that is sacred, the State would leave to them the charge of that impious work; but never, in order to please them, could it be faithless to its own moral beliefs."*

The extreme liberality, the example here set of Christian forbearance and the wisdom of the policy adopted by France cannot fail to command the unqualified admiration of every one who values the application of history and the practice of nations, in the organisation of national constitutions. France, we are told, is sectarian, and for that reason the public schools and the Government are sectarian. This sectarianism cannot be ignored.—No foolish attempt has been made to do this; because the public sentiment would have repudiated the assumption of a manifest lie. In Canada our Government has been less scrupulous about the consistency of fact and profession. It has permitted the Educational Department to propagate the assumption that the Government of Canada is not sectarian and that therefore it cannot recognize the general claims of the various religious sections into which the community is divided. This assumption, this profession of faith has been stuck on the forehead of our Government without raising one single symptom of remonstrance, and has been published broadcast over the Province and to the world in monthly and annual Reports and Pamphlets without limit. For its falsehood it might be sufficient to refer to the number of private sectarian Bills passed and recorded in the statute book, every session; and to the continued legislation on separate schools. Here, as in France, every sect has its representatives in the Legislature of the Province. It cannot be reasonably assumed here, any more than there that each representative loses his sectarian character the moment he becomes elected by a

* "Elle (la France) n'a pas proclamé une religion de l'Etat, ecqui eût été mensonge, sous une forme du Gouvernement où les grands corps de l'Etat sont les représentans directs de l'opinion publique; mais elle a assuré protection et secours à tous les cultes chrétiens, et ainsi, sous ce rapport, elle s'est tenue dans le vrai. Elle a constaté aux yeux du monde que les croyances chrétiennes, sans exception d'Eglise ou de Secte, sont celles de la Nation Française. La France, après s'être déclarée chrétienne dans la Charte, après avoir constaté, comme un fait considérable, que la religion Catholique est professée par la majorité des Français, ne peut pas, sous peine d'inconséquence, oublier ce point de départ quand il s'agit pour elle d'organiser l'Education publique. Lorsqu'elle fonde des établissement qui intéressent l'éducation morale de la jeunesse, elle ne peut pas les placer en dehors du principe moral qu'elle affirme elle-même; mais elle n'oublira pas non plus qu'elle est olérante et qu'elle aime par-dessus tout la liberte de conscience; toutes les Communions Chrétiennes trouveront donc, dans ses établissemens d'éducation publique, l'accueil hospitalier qu'elle leur a promis dans la Charte. Nous aimons à voir, qu'à ses yeux toutes les Sectes Chrétiennes sont sœurs, et qu'elle leur accorde la même sollicitude dans l'administration de la grande famille.—Quand aux hommes qui veulent élever leur enfans dans le mépris systématique de tout ce qui est saint, l'Etat pourrait leur laisser la charge de cette œuvre impie; mais jamais pour leur complaire, il ne fut permis de manquer à ses croyances morales."—*De l'Education Populaire et des Ecoles Normales Primaires, considérées dans leurs Rapports avec la Philosophie du Christianisme. Par M. P. Dumont. Ouvrage auquel l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques a décerné un prix extraordinaire en* 1840, *pages* 40, 41, 42, 43.

constituency, or on his entrance to the Legislative chamber. On the contrary, the sectarian element is as strong and as operative in the House of Assembly, and in the Legislative and Executive Councils as in the other relations of public life. Every person who has any acquaintance with the practice and custom of legislation knows this to be the case, and that it is not possible it could be otherwise. But what is most remarkable in this comparison is the consistency of the facts and professions in the case of France, and the honesty of purpose with which the avowal is made that the Government is necessarily sectarian. Contrast this with the disingenuousness, on our part, of professing the Government unsectarian, while its acts of sectarian legislation prove that profession to be a falsehood. And the contrast ends not here. As, in the first lessons of the school, the child is taught that *a consonant is a letter that can be sounded by itself;* and, when more advanced, that *the art of grammar is a science;* so is the Government and the country instructed, by the Educational Department, in a new species of mathematical exactness, namely, that *the whole is not the sum of all its parts;* or, that *the constituent elements of a compound have nothing to do in determining the character of that compound.* This is the amount of the logic of the Educational Department; and, in our opinion, the beginning and cause of the unfortunate dissentions with which the work of education has been attended. The assumption of a non-sectarian character for the Government of Canada is the foundation on which the non-religious Canadian common school system is laid. This foundation is, however, as we have shown, false, and the fruits of this first grand mistake are visible in the prevailing educational legislative dissentions, and the general dissatisfaction with respect to the non-religious character of the schools.

This much was necessary to be said, in order to be able to appreciate fully the purport of the two pamphlets, mentioned at the head of this article, on which we propose to remark. The first professes, by its title page, to be a correspondence which had taken place on the law of separate schools, but is evidently designed as a medium for the Chief Superintendent to circulate through the country, *ex parte* statements, on debateable points, connected with the working of the school system. Accordingly, this correspondence has appended a letter, addressed to the Hon. Attorney-General Macdonald, occupying 18 pages of a pamphlet of 40 pages. Three things in this letter are deserving of special notice—First, the evasion of the facts contained in Mr. Dallas's pamphlet; second, the attempt to implicate the Chief Justice of Upper Canada, Sir John Beverley Robinson, in a contradiction; and last, the assumed misconception of the principle for which the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto has been contending. We shall notice these three points in the order in which they are placed.

The school system introduced to Canada by the present Chief Superintendent, was, from the first, considered as an experiment; and, consequently, should have been amenable to the criticisms of the public press. It was scarcely possible that its merits could be properly tested without the application of an ordeal of this kind; and the strongest proof of its defects is the care, the assiduity, the sensitiveness that has been evinced all along to check attempts at investigation. If Mr. Dallas's pamphlet possessed no other merit, it was entitled to consideration, from the circumstance that it broke through a silence and a monotonous state of the public mind, on school matters, that would be scarcely credible if we had no knowledge of the fact. But it contains statements, impeaching the character and machinery of the Normal and Common Schools, which are either true or false. If true, it is certainly proper that they should be known. If false, they should have been refuted. That no attempt has been made to refute them, either by the Chief Superintendent, or by that portion of the press which supports his school doctrines, is, at least, a strong presumption that they are incapable of refutation. Yet the Chief Superintendent has the coolness to say, in his letter to the Attorney-General, with reference to Mr. Dallas's statements—"The professed facts of this pamphlet are fictions, so far as they apply to our schools, and so far as they relate to myself personally, and to the Normal School." Notwithstanding, however, this convenient but unsatisfactory denial, the professed facts are there, and must be dealt with in some way or other, before that public expectation can be satisfied. Now, what are these facts? The most prominent is the Unitarian or Deistical religious basis of the Common School system. The proofs are derived from the official records of the Province, and from the Revised Statutes and other official documents of the State of Massachusetts, from whence the Canadian system has been imported. Corroborative testimony to sustain the charge that the character of the system is not Christian, has been furnished since, by a resolution of the Council of Public Instruction, having reference to a disallowance, on the part of the Government, of the "official prayers" which were attempted to be forced on the schools. It will be observed that the following resolution makes mention only of Grammar Schools, but Common Schools should have been also included, for the disallowed law was applicable to both. It is as follows:—

> "*Ordered*—That the Council, in preparing a code of Regulations for the Grammar Schools, felt that it was highly desirable to secure, so far as they could, without infringing on religious liberty, *such a recognition of Christianity*, by prayer and the reading of a portion of the scripture, as would impress upon the pupils a due appreciation of the importance of religious duties, and becoming reverence for the word of God."

Here is an explicit avowal that the object of the "official prayers" was to gain something which was absent, and for which there was an expressed want. That something is a "recognition of Christianity." So that Christianity is not recognized in the School system. Is not this admission, by the Council of Public Instruction, corroborative of the leading fact stated, in Mr. Dallas's pamphlet, that the schools have no Christian basis, and therefore are not Christian, because they ignore the visible signs of Christianity? But look at the position in which the Chief Superintendent is placed; by this admission, on the one hand, of a fact, and denying it, on the other hand, as a fiction.

The next prominent fact is the condition of the Normal School. On this head we cannot do better than give the practical testimony of a First-class Teacher, from the *Globe* newspaper of 9th April last. The evidence of a person engaged in the business of teaching, and who is competent to pass an opinion on the circumstances that have come under his personal observation, should, in this case, command a due share of respect. For this reason it is here cited, and is as follows:—

> "It cannot be denied that the common schools of Toronto have not kept pace with the improvement of the age, nor have the results been in any degree adequate to the expenditure; and this is owing, in a great measure, to the disgust which was created a few years ago against the schools, by appointing as

teachers incompetent and inexperienced persons, who had been manufactured at the Normal School on the shortest notice. Many excellent teachers on this account resigned in disgust, and sought employment elsewhere, or in another vocation.

"The third chapter expresses my sentiments exactly, and I believe the facts of the case. If Mr. D. had consulted me in its compilation, I would not have altered it much. But before we find such men for *all* common schools, as the specimen cited by a "Prussian Schoolmaster," there must be a radical change in the Education Office, as well as in the Normal School, besides a general increase in salaries: such men can find employment in other lines of business, more remunerative and less irksome. Mr. D. gives the Normal School authorities a severe overhauling; but facts are always stubborn things. To the certain knowledge of the writer, many of those who were trained at the Normal School, have abandoned the profession of teaching—some after having failed, and others *before embarking* in it. The picture drawn on page 27, of the young teacher from the Normal School, has had its counterpart in many of the school sections throughout the country."

As illustrative of what is here stated by a First-class Teacher, and in support of the charge against the character of the Normal School, we add here the copy of an application for a situation in this city, by a teacher holding a certificate from the said Normal School, as follows:

"July 13, A.D. 1855.

"Dear Sir. I take the opportunity of wrighting these fue lines to you to let you know that I want to go to you as a clerk this summer and if you please wright to me as soon as you Can and let me know if you want anney or not in your store let me know now and if you please wright to me if you hear any that wants one far or near but I hope that you will take me yourself for some time & I am ready to go now or any other time betwik this and next fall I was teaching school til nou but my time is out tommoroh and I holdes the *third class certificate* I have no more to say at presant but my kinde respect I am your frend.

"Be sure and wright to me and let me no whether I will get there or not."

How much testimony of a similar nature could be furnished, we leave the teachers themselves and the parents who are most deeply interested to answer. Go where we will, in town or country, the same complaint is heard on all sides. But let us not be misunderstood. It is not intended to affirm that there are no good teachers in the Province, nor that some of those holding first-class certificates are not competent. By no means. But we do affirm that the few good teachers to be found, holding first-class certificates, are not indebted to the Normal School for the abilities they possess. On enquiry, it will be found that such teachers, previously enjoying a reputation as good teachers, merely passed through the Normal School routine for the purpose of saving themselves from Government proscription; or they are persons of natural talent, who, by native energy and extraordinary efforts, have mastered their profession, and would have succeeded as well in any other undertaking, despite of defective tutorship and a false and erroneous system of training. This is not a point on which bare assertions can be of any consequence. The facts are within the cognizance of every one who reads what is here written. There is no parent, residing in the neighborhood of a common school, and participating directly or indirectly in its management, who has not frequent opportunities of hearing and knowing a good deal about the character of the teachers. It would be superfluous, therefore, to fill our pages with examples of what every one has, thus, opportunities of determining for himself.

Is it a fiction, that the common school system of Canada is a piece-meal importation from Boston, and was designed expressly for a Unitarian and Republican community? Is it a fiction, that Dr. Ryerson, following in the footsteps of Mr. Mann, has contended for compulsory measures, by which to force the children of respectable people to sit on the same school forms with the most immoral and depraved children, picked off the public streets? Is it a fiction, that, previous to the appearance of Mr. Dallas's pamphlet, almost every monthly number of the *Journal of Education* was filled with laudatory commendations of the Unitarian and Republican school authorities of the United States, in place of being devoted to the practical management of the school machinery? Is it a fiction, that, contrary to the spirit of our municipal institutions, a system of centralisation, in school government, has been established, including the Common and Grammar Schools and the University, on the plan adopted by Mr. Mann? Is it a fiction, that, wherever free schools are established, the assessment is calculated for the education of all the children of school age in the section, township, or municipality, while only a comparatively small number of poor children attend them? Is it a fiction, that the ornamental appearance of the buildings and the pictorial decoration of the walls inside have been of more consequence than the forming of good teachers? Is it a fiction, that, to obtain a first, second, or third-class certificate, the applicant is not required to know more than the simple routine of holding on by a few set rules and forms, as leading strings, in the school room? Is it a fiction, that most of the students attending the Normal School renounce the intention of becoming teachers, or abandon the profession, after having given the business a trial, thus causing a useless waste of the public funds? These are the prominent facts set forth and argued in Mr. Dallas's pamphlet, and to which Dr. Ryerson has, evasively, refrained from attempting a reply. They are, however, before the Legislature and the country, and supply food for reflection. One thing should be observed, that the school system is an experiment not yet tested. The experiment is only going on. But of what use is the process of experimenting, if no questions are to be asked, and the immense fund at the disposal of the Education Office is to be successfully employed in gagging the press and stifling enquiry? Many, we are aware, have a belief that nothing should be done to mar the designs of the present school authorities; and honestly denounce anything having that tendency. This is, however, a mistaken indulgence; because it can be shown that the theory, according to which these authorities profess to be guided, is untenable. According to Socrates, the necessary condition of the right understanding of any subject, is to be able to explain it to others. We ask no more than this. If the theory is false, and it can be shown that this is demonstrated by the unfitness of the practice, what better service can be rendered, than giving publicity to the fact, and arguing the several issues on their intrinsic merits, for the benefit of the public, by whose decision the conflict must finally be determined.

The second point, deserving of notice, in the letter of the Chief Superintendent to the Attorney General, has reference to remarks made by Chief Justice Robinson on two separate occasions. Dr. Ryerson, it will be observed, does not deny that the extract from the address of the Chief Justice, cited in the title page of Mr. Dallas' pamphlet, expresses distrust of the school system; but with a most unaccountable disregard for the reputation of others, in his anxiety to save the character of his system, he adduces an extract from a subsequent address of the Chief Justice to show that the Chief Justice approved of the system. Thus, in short, attempting, without the smallest grain of compunction, to make the

public believe that the two addresses are contradictory of each other. Now, any one reading these two extracts, without reference to the religious aim of the one and the secular aim of the other, would naturally suppose them to be contradictory. But with this reference it is not possible that such a mistake can occur. We insert the two quotations here for the purpose of affording an opportunity to compare them:

"There is, we all know, a difficulty which has met at the threshold those who have been influential in establishing systems of national education; I mean that which arises from the number of religious sects into which the population is divided. This is not the occasion for entering into any discussion upon that painfully interesting question. Whatever difficulty it has occasioned in England or Ireland must be expected to be found here, applying with at least equal, if not more than equal force. I should be unwilling to suppose that any doubt could exist as to my own opinion on this question; and scarcely less unwilling to be thought so unjust and uncandid as not to acknowledge and make allowance for the difficulties which surround it. They are such, I believe, as no person can fully estimate until he has been called upon to deal with them, under the responsibility which the duties of government impose. In the meantime, resting assured as we may, that no general system of instruction can be permanently successful which has not the confidence and cordial approval of the sincerely religious portion of the community—that portion, I mean, who will think it worse than folly to aim at being wise above that which is written—we must wait with hope and patience for the solution which this difficulty, to which I allude, may receive in other countries more competent to grapple with it—trusting that what may ultimately be found to be the safe and satisfactory course, may, by the wisdom and good feeling of the majority, be adopted among ourselves."—*Speech of Chief Justice Robinson, at the opening of the Provincial Normal School, Nov.* 24, 1852.

"If the system of Common School education which pervades all parts of Upper Canada, shall continue to be maintained in full efficiency, which there is no reason to doubt, the number of those who can enter with pleasure and profit into discussions upon subjects of science will be immensely increased; and those whose generous aim it may be to enlighten and improve others by communicating freely the results of their own researches and experiments, will find abundance of hearers and readers able to understand and reason upon their theories.

"There is good ground, too, for expectation that, with the advantage of the Public Libraries, selected as they are with care and judgment, which are being formed within the several counties, and even within each school section, a spirit of inquiry will be fostered, and an ambition excited to be distinguished in scientific pursuits, which we may hope will in time add largely to the number and variety of interesting contributions to the Institute."—*Address of Chief Justice Robinson before the Canadian Institute, 8th January,* 1855.

The first of the above two extracts, it will be seen, is taken up, exclusively, with the religious aspect of the school question. First, the difficulties that lie in the way, occasioned by the conflicting claims of the various sects, are stated; next, the speaker's own settled convictions; thirdly, the assurance that no system (meaning, of course, the Canadian system) can be permanently successful which is opposed by that class of religious people, not conceitedly wise in school matters and not inclined to set the oracles of visionary and ignorant enthusiasts above the authority of Holy Writ and the traditions of the Christian Church; and finally, the solemn admonition to wait and profit by the experience of other countries, better able, by the superiority of their intellectual resources, to construct a proper system. Here is a most complete condemnation not only of the non-religious character of American education, but also of United States and Canadian educationists; the men who aim at levelling all distinctions of rank and worth in society by beginning the levelling process in the school room; and who, with the most bland professions of christianity on their lips and on their educational sign posts, repudiate Christian teaching and deny to religious communities the exercise of their religious rights. Any one who can read these remarks of Chief Justice Robinson and fail to perceive the pointedness and significance with which they aim at the system of irreligious education must be willfully blind. The second extract, on the contrary, has exclusive reference to the beneficial influence which the secular instruction of the common schools would have on the promotion of science in connection with the Canadian Institute. Of course no one denies the scientific tendency of secular education. This tendency is all that the second extract expresses. It does not follow, because the irreligious character of the system is condemned, that the secular character should share the same fate. About its capacity to sharpen the intellect there is no dispute. That is admitted, as the natural and necessary result of secular influence. What is denied is its power to cultivate the heart and affections, while the religious element which is alone capable of doing this, is wanting. Then, as to the phraseology, the prefixed "If" throws doubt on the continuance of the *secular* efficiency of the system. So, also, the parenthesis "which there is no reason to doubt," does not necessarily imply the antithesis—belief. It conveys neither affirmation nor denial of the continuance or non-continuance of the efficiency. A person may have no reason to doubt of a thing; but, simultaneously, he may have no reason to believe it. Or he may calculate on a prospective event, without having a reason to create either a belief or doubt that such event will actually take place. A little attention to the exact meaning of the language employed will show that the speaker had, probably, as little reason not to believe as not to doubt that the secular efficiency would be continued, and therefore expressed no decisive opinion either one way or the other. On the whole, then, we see that while Chief Justice Robinson, in the last extract, admits the efficiency of the secular power of the school system to promote the objects of science, he condemns most unequivocally, in the first of those two extracts, its non-religious character and its inadequacy to satisfy the religious wants of the community.

The third and last topic, worthy of notice, in the letter to the Attorney General, and that which constitutes the burden of its contents, is the separate school claim. Here Dr. Ryerson, though forseeing the unavoidable result of the contest and sufficiently apprehensive of a day of retribution, manages to keep up a sort of defensive fusilade for no other apparent reason than to evade and put off the acknowledgment that the American common school system, though adapted to the religious and political atmosphere of Boston, for which it was specially intended, is altogether unfit for religious and political institutions of a diametically opposite character, such as exist in this Province. Two circumstances have given Dr. Ryerson a semblance of superiority in conducting his defence. One, the disparity, in a political sense, between himself and his immediate antagonist, Bishop Charbonnel. The other, the limitation of the separate school question, as one between Protestants and Roman Catholics only. But however dexterously the political weapons may have been employed, on the one side, and however unequally they may have been handled, on the other, cannot affect, in the slightest, the real facts in dispute; neither can the persecution carried on, ostensibly, only against the Roman Catholics, be supposed to save the churches of England and Scotland from excommunication.

Stripping the question of all its sophistry and subterfuge, let us examine the claims for religious liberty, in school matters, on their own merits. If we take the population of Canada at 2,300,000, what it is stated to be at the present time, the Roman Catholics may be fairly assumed to comprise one half, and the Protestants another half, of the whole number. Of this last division, the adherents of the church of England are doubly or trebly more numerous than the adherents of any other Protestant body; and those of the church of Scotland form, also, a large proportion. So that, according to this estimate, a majority of the whole population of Canada, consisting of 1,150,000 Roman Catholics, a preponderating proportion of adherents of the English church and a large proportion of those in connection with the church of Scotland, claim to have a combined religious and secular school system. Dr. Ryerson's distinction of an Upper Canada system from a Lower Canada system, required as he presumes, on account of the different forms of municipal government, cannot be admitted to justify the division of the Province into two distinct sections for intolerant educational purposes; in the first place, because a difference in the form of municipal government has nothing to do with the principle of religious liberty; and, in the second, because the Roman Catholics themselves demand that the same equality of religious freedom, in school matters, shall be exercised in the Western and the Eastern portions of the Province, without distinction. Here, then, is one fact and the principal fact with which the Legislature will have to deal, namely, that a majority of the population of the Province demands a combined religious and secular common school system. Compared with this, all the other issues are of minor importance.

That spurious species of Protestantism which belies the great principle of liberty of conscience for which Luther contended is as fruitful, at the present moment, among ourselves, of inconsistencies and absurdities as it has been in other countries. The Unprotestant legislation of the Puritans who landed at Plymouth, the Unprotestant treatment of the English dissenters whose grievances are recorded in the history of England, and the Unprotestant treatment of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, at the present day, are only different phases of the same spirit of intolerance which commenced in this Province, with the introduction of the Boston school system, in 1846, and has been increasing ever since. What Dr. Ryerson is contending for is the Roman Catholic principle of uniformity of discipline. What all true Protestants, on the other hand, maintain, is the right, not only to differ from the church of Rome, but, also, the right of Protestants to differ among themselves. Wherein is the difference between the dictum of our Canadian school legislator and that of the self-styled prophet, Munzer. Human folly, not to call it by a worse name, has a thousand ways of displaying itself. Munzer too, was a Preacher, and a Protestant; he too, taught that there was no necessity for sectarian differences of religion nor for distinctions of rank, which he said were unchristian because in heaven all men are equal. Acting on these doctrines of equality and communism he attracted multitudes in Thuringia and Hesse to his standard, for he too had followers. But after carrying his levelling doctrines into practical effect, by plundering the rich, destroying the castles of the nobility and burning the Monasteries, he and his leading accomplices paid at last the penalty of their pretensions, on the scaffold. It is, in like manner, not many years since Barnum, of New York, undertook to demonstrate to the world, that the hostility between the different species of the lower animals is occasioned by educational habits and is unnatural. Barnum's motive was to teach mankind that, as among beasts, so in human society distinctions arise from causes that are capable of being controlled. He too, held the belief that sectarianism and distinctions of rank should be abolished. Looking at the method he adopted to demonstrate his problem, and comparing it with the experiment to destroy sectarianism in Canada, we cannot perceive that there is less absurdity in the one case than in the other. Our Canadian educational experiment and that of Barnum are, in this respect, much on a par. They appear to have originated, alike, in the same kind of visionary conception, to have been governed by the same principle, and to aim at a similar object. Barnum commenced by getting a large cage, the representative of the unsectarian school room. Into this cage he put a Cat, a Rat, some Mice, a Monkey, a Squirrel, a Guinea Pig, a Dog, a Vulture, a Hawk, an Owl, some Pigeons and small birds, with several other kinds of animals; in like manner as, in the unsectarian school, the Episcopalian and Presbyterian, the Roman Catholic and the Baptist, the Methodist and the Unitarian have been brought together. Now Barnum's mistake was not a whit greater, when he put the Cat and the Mouse together, than the mistake by the authors of our school system, in obliging a Unitarian and Episcopalian to sit on the same school form; for it is just as impossible to make the Episcopalian embrace the habits of the Unitarian as to put the Mouse in love with the practices of the Cat. The natural instincts of the animals, in the cage, may be restrained while the man, with the stick, stands, as a sentinel, ready to punish every transgressor against the laws of equality and fraternity. So may the unsectarian teacher restrain the children from exercising, in the school, the imbibed instincts of their parents.—But the instincts, in both cases, still exist, and find vent the moment the artificial restraints are removed. Barnum may claim success and fancy that he has duped his visitors into a belief that animal instincts can be destroyed, and unsectarian common school educationists may boast that their system is established and that it works well and is efficient, but every one having common sense and not immediately benefiting by the speculation, must look upon the whole affair as an imposture. It never was designed that there should be uniformity of thought any more than of form and shape and color in the external aspect of things. The whole beauty of the natural world consists in its change of scene and its extreme variety and dissimilarity. We dont find in the whole forest two trees that are alike. No two human beings can be found with the same features, either of mind or body. Some are born rich, while others never know any other companion than poverty with its attendant discomforts. One man possesses an inherent spirit of enterprise that aspires after distinctiou; how many others crawl through life, the obsequious fawning sycophants of the wealthy and the powerful? So it is now; so it ever has been; and so it will be in all time to come. The error of some men is a habit of dealing with fictions. They cannot see that the world with all that is in it possesses fixed specific characteristics which human efforts cannot alter; that all is perfection; that, as Pope happily and truly says, "whatever is—is right."—They seek to change not only the settled institutions which time and the common assent of mankind have rendered venerable, but also human nature itself.

Next to the cardinal virtue of Christianity, namely, Charity, is the sentiment of Justice. "Do to others as ye would that they should do to you," is a rule laid down for the government of the mutual relations in which men stand to each other. The Dissenters of England and the Roman Catholics of Ireland have protested very properly and justly against the exaction of tithes and church rates for the maintainance of a church establishment to which neither of them belongs. And the grievance becomes more aggravated when it is considered that, at the same time, they pay for the building of their own churches and for the support of their own clergy. There is no end to the clamour of what is, thus, considered an injustice and extortion. But how is it with ourselves, and by whom is the same injustice meted out here? Who pays for the building of the common school houses and the support of the common schools? Have not the Episcopalians and others to pay for the erection and maintainance of these schools, against the injustice of which they protest; while they have to provide and support other schools for the education of their own children? Is this doing as we would like others to do to us? Is the Canada Episcopalian in any better position than the English Dissenter, or the Irish Roman Catholic?

There can be no greater blessing in any country than a permanent system of good common schools. But to be good and permanent it must have, in the words of Chief Justice Robinson, "*the confidence and approval of the sincerely religious portion of the community, that portion who will think it worse than folly to aim at being wise above that which is written.*" The school question is one which the Legislature will have to take hold of and settle, in a permanent way, to the satisfaction of all parties, and all creeds, and to the exclusion of none. The scruples of the various religious bodies must be respected; the centralisation scheme must be broken up, and the principle of self-government, which is in accordance with our municipal system, adopted in its stead; religious and secular instruction must be combined; the school law of Upper and Lower Canada must be assimilated; the endless compilation of school Acts and Amended Acts must be cancelled; the administration of school affairs must become a Government department, and be presided over by a Minister of Public Instruction who is a member of the Cabinet, and who is neither a preacher nor an educational theorist. When these changes are completed we may then expect to witness unanimity and concord in the schools, and a generous rivalry to promote the true objects for which schools are considered desirable.

We have expressed our views fully and clearly in discussing this question, and trust that those who differ from us will do us the justice to consider our remarks as intended to elicit truth from a comparison of conflicting opinions. *Ex parte* or garbled representations of things are reduced to a proper estimate wherever the press is independent enough to admit of unrestricted criticism, and sufficiently impartial to tolerate the expression of opposite and antagonistic sentiments. The importance of the subject and the prospect of parliamentary legislation upon it, at an early day, are strong reasons why it should be fully canvassed by those who have bestowed on it some share of attention; and no less imperative is the call, by a majority of the population, that its claims should be heard, and the reasons stated, in its behalf, why the system should be remodelled, and why distraction must continue to operate and pervade the entire management of school affairs till justice shall be amply awarded, without exclusion, either religious or secular, of any class or any body which is subjected to their influence.

Turkey, Past and Present: its History, Topography, and Resources. By J. M. Morell. London, 1854.

The War, from the Landing at Gallipoli to the Death of Lord Raglan. By W. H. Russell. London, 1855.

Turkey, Russia, the Black Sea, and Circassia. By Capt. Spencer. London, 1855.

The Balance of Power. A Letter to the *Times* Newspaper. By a Traveller in Italy. 1855.

Two Letters to the People of England on the War. By Joseph Mazzini. London, 1855.

The difficulties surrounding an amicable adjustment of the Eastern contest are, in no degree, surmounted by the attention it has received, and the talent that has been employed in the work of negotiation. The skill of diplomacy, as well as the suggestions of the popular mind, exhausted, fruitless, and unsatisfactory, can discover no principle which might serve as a common basis for the conditions on which peace should be decided. There is no Pytho, with its temple, to receive our propitiatory offerings; no Pythia to communicate to us the much desired oracular response; and no Sibylline Canons to consult, on the dangers and uncertainties that lie hid in the obscurity of the future. Should the *status quo* be preserved? should new territorial arrangements be effected, to limit Russian power in the South? should the integrity of Turkey be guaranteed?—are questions that, at this moment, are as perplexing, and as far from a satisfactory solution, as they were at the date, when first war was declared in March, 1854. And these perplexities are, in no small measure, heightened by the reflection that we may have to wait the issue of a protracted series of campaigns, in order that the conditions of peace may be arbitrated by the fortunes of the battle-field.

Nothing would be more easy than to follow the example of our compeers, and indulge a spirit of declamation against the aggressive proceedings of Russia. Like them we might go on to the construction of a new dynastic map for Europe, or the organisation of independent nationalities. And like them we might derive a momentary feeling of gratification from the survey of such creations of the fancy. We prefer, however, to deal with the facts as they exist, and to take things as we find them, irrespective of peculiar or national predilections. Were our own feelings to be consulted, we would name the line of the Caucasus, the northern coast of the Black Sea, and the Pruth, as the southern limit of Russia. This appears the natural boundary, and many reasons exist why it would have been desirable to preserve it. But what we might wish is one thing. That which is practicable is another. If this distinction had been observed, by the Western Powers, at the commencement of the struggle, many false movements might have been avoided, and the preparations and resources would have been on a scale commensurate with the magnitude of the enterprise. The first fault committed, the greatest fault attending the management of the war, and the fault most common, among influential writers, at the present moment, is that of undervaluing the power of Russia. We know of no practice so culpable, seeing the disastrous consequences to which it has led, than that of deceiving

one's self, by allowing national prejudice to obscure the reason, and pervert the circumstances and data, which are so much required to be known, in order to be able to estimate our true relative position.

Russia in Europe has a population of 62,000,000, united by a common Slavic origin, professing one religious faith, and living under a form of government which, for military purposes and conquest, has no equal. It is situated, besides, in the most inaccessible part of the continent, and is protected by the severity of the climate, no less than by an extent of territory measuring 104,731 square miles. A despotic monarchy so constituted, little as it may suit our notions of constitutional freedom, is, nevertheless, well adapted for aggression. It possesses, also, ample means of security against an invading force. The power of Russia does not, however, consist exclusively of these internal resources. Great as they are in themselves, they are rendered still more potent by external and negative circumstances that are apt to be overlooked. The political and religious dissentions of Turkey and the revolutionary tendencies of the Austrian Provinces, together with the Slavic relationship of a large portion of the populations of both Turkey and Austria, operate directly to give Russia a preponderance in the European balance of nations. Of this, the Hungarian revolt furnished one illustration. Austria did not apply to France or England for succor in that emergency. Because their sympathies were known to lean altogether the other way. No; the appeal was made to Russia, and the promptitude with which it was answered should have opened the eyes of Lord Palmerston to the importance of sustaining the dynastic rights of Austria. Herein lies the secret of Austria's neutrality. Lord Palmerston's tampering with Kossuth, during the Hungarian revolt, and after it had been suppressed, is telling, with fearful effect, on the fortunes of the war. Results of great magnitude have their causes often remote, in minute and scarcely discernible incidents; which, however, it is necessary to trace and to comprehend, before it is possible to understand the whole bearings, or to prescribe means for the adjustment of a complicated dispute. It is so here. The alliance of Austria with the Western Powers could only have been secured on the fulfillment of certain conditions; the principal of which was a territorial guarantee. If Austria could have relied on the protection of the Western Powers, and had possessed confidence in the sympathy of England, at a time when a dismemberment of the empire was attempted, we would have saved ourselves from being made the scapegoat of what is now termed Austrian duplicity. Lord Palmerston's sympathy with the Hungarian cause had a powerful moral influence to nerve the Hungarian leaders to put forth their whole strength. Austria was cognizant of this fact. And what made the case worse, and aggravated in a tenfold degree the sympathy given to Hungary, were the pretensions advanced by England, favoring a systematic propagandism of religious firebrands in the Austrian dominions. While we were acting thus, in every possible way, to disturb the dynastic relations of a necessary power in the European balance, and wantonly tendering offence where our immediate interests should have prescribed conciliation, the sagacity of Russia dictated a course which she at once perceived would permanently tach Austria to her interests, and bring an accession of strength that would enable Russia to cope with the forces of England and France combined. We talk now of guaranteeing the integrity of the Turkish dominions. It is only the other day we talked of guaranteeing the disintegration of Austria. Where is the policy by which we have been guided in our relations with the rest of Europe? What sort of policy is it which demands friendship for the Sultan and contumely for the House of Hapsburg? This inconsistency was the initiatory step to our present troubles. And to it, more than to all other conspiring agencies combined, we attribute the encouragement given to Russia to invade Turkey; the neutrality of Austria, and Prussia, and the German States; and last, though not least, the difficulty of finding a basis on which to arrange the conditions of a permanent peace.

The difference of races and creeds exposes Turkey to the machinations of other Powers.* This is the principal cause of the weakness of the Ottoman government. While Russia has exercised a protectorate over 10,000,000 of a Turkish population professing the faith of the Greek Church, France and England have contended for an amelioration of the condition of the Roman Catholics and other Christians, subjects of the Porte. The same interference has been practised by France and England with the internal religious affairs of Turkey, that was attempted by England in the religious affairs of Austria. If the principle of interference is to be justified in one case, there is no reason why it should not apply with as much force in the other. The extent to which that interference may be carried, must depend, in all cases, on contingent circumstances. The admission of the principle is the point which requires consideration. And here arises a question of very grave import: Is non-interference in the internal, political, commercial, and religious affairs of foreign countries, to be considered a part of the international law of Europe? A great deal has been said about non-interference; and the principle

* DIVISION INTO PROVINCES.

European Turkey:—		
Thrace	1,800,000	
Bulgaria	3,000,000	
Moldavia	1,400,000	
Wallachia	2,600,000	
Bosnia and Herzegowina	1,100,000	
Roumelia and Thessaly	2,700,000	
Albania	1,200,000	
Servia	1,000,000	
Islands	700,000	
		15,500,000
Asiatic Turkey:—		
Anatolia or Asia Minor	10,800,900	
Syria, Mesopotamia, and Kurdistan	4,500,000	
Arabia (Mecca, Medina, Æthiopia)	900,000	
		16,200,000
African Turkey:—		
Egypt	2,000,000	
Tripoli, Tunis, Oasis of Fez	1,800,000	
		3,800,000
Total		35,500,000

DIVISION INTO RACES.

Races.	Europe.	Asia.	Africa.	Total.
Ottomans	2,150,000	10,800,000	.....	12,950,000
Greeks	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....	2,000,000
Armenians	400,000	2,000,000	.....	2,400,000
Jews	70,000	80,000	.....	150,000
Sclavonians	6,200,000	.....	.....	6,200,000
Roumani	4,000,000	.....	.....	4,000,000
Albanians	1,450,000	.....	.....	1,450,000
Tartars	16,000	50,000	.....	66,000
Arabs	.....	900,000	3,800,000	4,700,000
Syrians and Chaldæans	.....	250,000	.....	250,000
Druses	.....	30,000	.....	30,000
Kurds	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
Turcomans	.....	90,000	.....	90,000
Gipsies	214,000	.....	.....	214,000
Total	15,500,000	16,200,000	3,800,000	35,500,000

DIVISION INTO CREEDS.

Confessors.	Europe.	Asia.	Africa.	Total.
Mussulmans	4,600,000	12,650,000	3,800,000	21,050,000
Greeks†	10,000,000	3,000,000	.....	13,000,000
Catholics†	660,000	280,000	.....	940,000
Jews	90,000	80,000	.....	170,000
Different Sects	.....	.....	.....	340,000
Total	15,350,000	16,010,000	3,800,000	35,500,000

† *Turkey, Past and Present.* By J. M. Morell.

seems to have been first conceded, in the acknowledgment of the right of the French nation to choose its form of government and its Chief Magistrate. A fruitless contest to impose on France a dynasty that had been rejected and was no longer acceptable, necessitated, in this extreme case, the concession of a principle which has not been observed in the general intercourse of nations since; notwithstanding that, by the language of diplomacy, it might be supposed to constitute the rule of action. No good reason can be shown, however, why Russia should not dictate to Turkey the conditions on which the adherents of the Greek Church are to enjoy specified privileges and immunities, if France and England are to justify a similar encroachment, on their part, in favor of the rest of the Christian population. In this case, as in that of territorial guarantees, there is a glaring want of consistency. It is evident that the weakness of the Sultan's government consists in the foreign influences brought, at all times, to bear on and to neutralize the administration of the laws. It is not to be supposed that the Greek and Slavic races will submit quietly to Mohammedan rule, while these foreign influences hold out to them the prospect of emancipation; or that they will reconcile themselves to a Government not independent enough to enforce its own mandates. The object of the present war is to secure the independence of Turkey, and to make it strong enough, to be felt and to have weight, in the general balance of power. But it is surely a wrong way to complish that object, by subjecting the Turkish Government to foreign dictation. Turkish independence, if it is to be anything more than a name, must begin by strengthening the hands of the Sultan in his control over the races and religious communities constituting the population of the Turkish dominions, without reference to the claims or dictation of Russia, France, or England. But if Russia, on the pretext of protecting one class of Christians, France, under a similar pretext, of guarding the religious interests of another, and England, in like manner, equally pretensious for the freedom of a third, are to persist, imposing terms on the administration of the internal government of Turkey, that independence must become an impossibility. There is evidently a want of sincerity in professing one thing and doing another. It is playing fast and loose with the liberties of Europe to make a chess-board of Turkey, for the purposes of Russia on the one hand, and of the Western Powers on the other. If the object is to make Turkey independent, why not observe the conditions which are essential to the establishment of that independence? Why not begin by an act of self-negation, renounce all pretexts at interference on religious or other grounds, and then consistently protest against and resist the pretensions of Russia or any other Power? A procedure such as this would give Turkey internal strength, would unite the disjointed sections of the population, would subordinate the distinctions of race to the necessity for a strong, compact, and vigorous government, and enable her to check successfully all future attempts, by Russia, at territorial aggrandizement.

The power of Russia is thus to be imputed, in great measure, to the internal dissensions of her border neighbors, and the false and suicidal policy pursued by England and France in relation thereto. A knowledge of this fact is sufficient to indicate the true policy which ought to be adopted by the Western Powers. We must confess that we have little confidence in the early success of their combined efforts while Germany remains neutral; and no expectation that this neutrality will be parted from, unless a policy be adopted, which will protect the several German Governments against the consequences of a free and independent course of action. Whatever obstacles may stand in the way of determining the territorial limits which ought to be acknowledged, as comprising the area of Prussian, Austrian, or Turkish dominion, are in themselves insignificant, when compared with the advantages to be derived from mutual guarantees for the preservation of those prescribed boundaries. With respect to England, in particular, the necessity for this policy is the more imperative, on account of the vast interests at stake in her Indian possessions. The defeat of Russia, in the present war, and the capture of the Crimea, would not, of themselves, prevent a recurrence of the scenes which have been witnessed in the two last campaigns. Any temporary advantage gained by the Allies, notwithstanding its magnitude, can be no security to England against the extension of hostile foreign agencies, in the direction of the north-western frontiers of India. The present and future danger is not from the inherent and native resources, great as they are, which Russia possesses. These are comparatively of minor consequence now; as they will be hereafter, if the infatuated belligerent policy of one section of the British Cabinet is to be followed. The popular belief, and that which has lately controlled the course of the British Government, presumes that the humiliation of Russia, by depriving her of the Crimea and her Southern Caucasian Provinces, would effectually put a stop to further movements at a southern extension of territory. And thus the prospect of peace and the security against future aggression are made to depend altogether on the strength and efficiency of our military operations. This is the popular and fatal mistake which drove Lord Aberdeen from the Government, and gave Lord Palmerston an opportunity of reversing the policy of his predecessor. What was wanted, from the first, to deter Russia from entering the Principalities, or to drive her from them after they had been invaded, was an Austrian alliance. This, with Lord Aberdeen, was a *sine qua non*. The difficulties in the way of its accomplishment may safely be imputed to the precedents of Lord Palmerston in his management of our relations with Austria; and the distrust, thus previously created, may be said to have caused the failure of Lord Aberdeen's utmost exertions to effect an object so indispensable, and which would have been followed with positive and negative results, the importance of which it is scarcely possible to estimate sufficiently. With the cession of Lord Palmerston to the Government should have ended, however, all doubt as to the course which Austria would pursue. This alone was wanted to enable Austria to make a final resolve to tach her interests to those of Russia. Whatever advances were afterwards made to negotiate an Austrian alliance were illusory and deceptive; and the pretences still held out, with the same view, are, in our opinion, as destitute of candor as they are evidence of a want of sagacity. That Austria had no choice, but was forced, by the whole tenor of Lord Palmerston's administration, to form an alliance with Russia, is perceptible, not only in the fomentation of the internal religious troubles already referred to, the tacit support rendered to the Hungarian rebellion, and the Haynau correspondence, but, more emphatically, in the continuous threat to excite the oppressed nationalities. The strength and durability of that alliance may be inferred from the reply of the Emperor Nicholas to Sir G. H. Seymour: "You must understand that when I speak of Russia, I speak of

Austria as well; what suits the one suits the other; our interests as regards Turkey are perfectly identical." This language excited, at the time, in the mind of our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, a strong suspicion of the designs of Austria, and led the British public to believe that Austria was interested in the contemplated invasion of the Sultan's dominions. No question seems to have arisen as to the existence of other causes, which might account for the late Czar's confidence in the adhesion of Austria; and, least of all, was it supposed that the true cause might be discovered in our having betrayed to Austria a disposition to derange the administration of her internal government and encourage the alienation of her Provinces. She could have nothing conceivable to gain from the extension of the power of Russia, a nation already too powerful; and as little to expect from a struggle, in which her own territory might be converted into the battle-field, on which to decide the superiority of barbarism or civilisation. The late Czar's language is, however, capable of a satisfactory interpretation, if we connect with it the only known circumstances which could have influenced Austria to resolve on the position of neutrality which she continues faithfully to observe.

In our short-sighted denunciations of Russian aggression, we forget that France too, has coveted the preponderance of British power in the East; that she too has played a conspicuous part in the affairs of Turkey; and being a great military power, equally ambitious and aggressive, may at some future day, by means of new alliances, also endanger the safety of our Indian possessions. There is no provision against such a contingency. It may happen before the expiry of the present year. We know that intrigues have been carried on most sedulously at Constantinople, to control the government of the Sultan, and to graft French influence on Turkish manners; and that immense fortifications have been constructed in that city, by order of the Emperor of France, for what purpose remains yet to be disclosed. What security then has England, if even possessed of Russian guarantees, that her Eastern interests will not be exposed to similar encroachments? None whatever. The alliance between England and France, was a necessary step after the armies of Russia had crossed the Pruth. There was, under the circumstances, no alternative, no other recourse left. But while this alliance gave to France an opportunity and the means of avenging the insult offered to her national pride, it afforded England no advantage for the attainment of the object for which she was prompted to take up arms. The temporary check given to Russia, has been at the expense, to England, of promoting the interests of France at Constantinople. The restraining of one influence, has thus raised up another. In place of one present competitor for Eastern dominion, there is all likelihood that the future will witness two. And this is the fruit, in fact the penalty, of the popular policy pursued by Lord Palmerston towards Austria. What is the present position of England, in relation to the war? Is the *status quo* to be preserved; or is it necessary to make a new map of Europe? All is confusion. There is no definite plan. What is wanted is an Austrian alliance. That would set all right; it would have precluded the occasion for the war, and have spared the useless expenditure of material means, and the sacrifice of life. But the chance of that alliance has been forfeited; and the question now is,—what is to be done? A new arrangement of the frontier Provinces of Russia and Turkey would be highly desirable, if it could be effected without entailing elements of future strife much greater than already exist. We cannot agree with the opinion expressed in "the Letter to the *Times*," by "a Traveller in Italy," nor with the writer of the article in the November number of the *North British Review*; for, however clearly it may be shown, that the Caucasus range of mountains is the natural southern boundary of Russia, we do not think the difficulties of a new arrangement have been maturely considered. The chief of these difficulties, in our estimation, would be the extent to which France would participate in the altered relations of Turkey. The subsequent assistance, required to keep Russia within the prescribed limits, would necessarily open up a wide field for the growth and promotion of French interests and intrigue; which, in all probability, would play the same part, in the destinies of Turkey, that they have long practised in the affairs of Italy. There are many other considerations, but this may be put prominently forward as one demanding, above all others, the serious attention of those who advocate a change of the existing territorial boundaries.

It will be said, that these suspicions are not warranted by the understood and specificially expressed relations agreed by England and France, at the commencement of the war, and the friendly maintainance, since, of the terms on which their joint proceedings were to be regulated. And, furthermore, we may be told, it is impolitic and unwise to give currency to surmises that call in question the honor and integrity of our Ally. It is no secret, however, that these suspicions have found a place in high quarters, and that they have been circulated and canvassed by Eastern correspondents without much regard to reservation. Whatever delicacy may be supposed to exist on this head is, therefore, removed by the circumstance that the Eastern correspondents of the English press have generally referred to the increasing preponderance of France in the general affairs of Turkey, and the probable consequences to which it may ultimately lead. Among the latest communications of this nature is that of the Constantinople correspondent of the *London Record*, dated 10th December, 1855, from which we extract the following:

"In fact, the impression here in many quarters is, that the present Turkish Government has *now fallen under the influence of the Jesuits entirely!* The truth or otherwise of this opinion may probably ere long become more clear; meanwhile, it is perfectly evident, *that British influences are not now cordially received in the desired direction.* The Grand Vizier, Ali Pacha, is said to be a religious man, and an earnest Mahommedan. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fuad Effendi, is said to be a mere man of the world, whose opinion is, that nobody need or ought to change their religion, whatever that be; and, like Gallio, he cares for none of those things which ensue from others being differently minded on that subject;—or, rather, the fault of any disturbance and persecution lies, he thinks, at the door of the persecuted and suffering religionists themselves, and therefore they suffer justly. *I am not, accordingly, as sanguine as many good people in England seem to be about the immediate good effects of British Influences flowing out of the present alliance and war.* The Turks will take our help, our blood, our gold; but if Russia be excluded from the dominions of the Bospherous, it does not follow that British ideas must dominate in place of Muscovite. It is exceedingly difficult to obtain any accurate or well-grounded information as to what really passes in the Turkish mind, or to form any very satisfactory judgment of the real condition of the social and national vitality of this people. But, without wishing to be too confident on so doubtful a matter, I can see no good grounds for supposing it possible to prolong or materially renovate the condition of "the sick man." *Some strong hand must govern here in his stead; either openly, or under cover, at all events, of his name. France may do so instead of Russia, perhaps, or combinations yet unimagined, may arise. But if we expect, as many seem to do, that England will*

naturally now assume a position of influence here for good, in some proportion to her disinterested efforts and lavish expenditure, I apprehend such expectations will be disappointed, unless much more direct steps shall be taken to that end."

This, however, is only one example of the character of much of the newspaper correspondence which finds its way to England. One thing is to be observed with respect to it: The writers are on the spot where the scenes are transpiring that awaken those feelings of distrust. They are eye-witnesses of the intrigues to which they make reference; and, it is by no means likely that among so many witnesses, who have testified to the same effect, there can be misrepresentation. In discussing, therefore, the conduct of the Western Powers, with reference to the internal government of Turkey, there is no reason why French influence should not be estimated at its true value; and, if there are premonitory symptoms, which betoken subsequent and certain changes in their present amicable relations, it is but right to know what these symptoms are, in order to be prepared, and not be taken by surprise and at a disadvantage, when we may be called on to act under a class of circumstances different from any thing which, hitherto, may have been thought of.

The present sympathy for Turkey is much like what was elicited for Hungary; and at a former period for Greece. Then, as now, inordinate expectations were entertained about the vastness of the civilizing process which each would undergo after the attainment of independence. England employs Protestant agencies; the same that she made use of in the Hungarian troubles. France operates through the Roman Catholic Church, and Russia through the Greek. Contrary purposes are thus at work throughout, notwithstanding the open professions of unanimity. Had Kossuth and his associates been told in time, by England and France, that the independence of Hungary would be impolitic, because it would derange the balance of power, and, therefore, could not be acknowledged, the revolt would never have taken place, and the Hungarians would have been much better off than they are now. Neither would the revolt of the Greeks, in 1821, have occurred, had not the leaders relied on the sympathy of the Christian Powers. But did the foreign sympathy, so freely tendered in both cases, benefit either of these peoples? The fate of Hungary, occasioned exclusively by this foreign interference, is too well known to require explanation from us. That of Greece is too melancholy not to excite remorse for our indirect participation in the horrid tragedy of 1821, as well as for being the cause, partly, of the disappointed expectations and fruitless disaffection of the Greeks ever since. Relying on the sympathy of the Christian Powers, that disaffection was the cause, afterwards, of much cruelty, on the part of the Sultan, which afforded a pretext for England, France, and Russia, in 1827, to destroy, at Navarino, the whole Turkish fleet. The independence of Greece was then demanded, and France sent 20,000 of an army, which expelled the Turks from the Morea; at the same time that Russia entered Turkey with a force of 100,000 men. Yet, where is Greek independence now? Where is the independence of Hungary? And what will be the independence of Turkey at the conclusion of the present struggle? The three Christian Powers first excited the Greeks to revolt, and then declared war against the Sultan for the means which he took to put down the rebellion. No doubt strong measures were resorted to; and, under the circumstances, cruelties were practised, which would have been unnecessary but for the foreign influences which continued then, as they continue still, to fan the spirit of independence and to add fuel to the embers of revolution. It must be borne in mind, that these cruelties were the result of strong measures, demanded in consequence of the determined and resolute courage infused to the insurgents by the three Christian Powers. On this head Mr. Morell says: "The sanguinary scenes of the Greek insurrection of 1821 are a stain on the reign of Mahmoud; yet they admit of some palliation, when we recollect that the Greeks were as much his legitimate subjects as the Irish are those of England, that they stained their rebellion with atrocious crimes, and that, if the Sultan had been a Christian, his severity would have been vindicated and applauded by all the powers of Christendom."

Greece and Hungary, Italy and Turkey have been the victims of foreign interference. Their recorded histories will remain standing monuments of the infatuation of European statesmen. Had they been left to the slow, gradual, and efficient development of their own native resources, aided only by that pioneer and universal instrument of progress and civilisation—foreign commerce, their condition would have been in accordance both with their own individual interests and the interests of Europe. Of the susceptibility of the Ottoman character to the humanizing influences of a refined civilisation, various eastern travellers have written in the highest terms. And since the reign of Selim III., the various reforms adopted, and the general introduction of western institutions, especially those of France, go far to prove what Turkey is capable of becoming, if only protected against the disorganizing agencies of Greek, Protestant, and Roman Catholic propagandism. The haste with which religious enthusiasm goes to work, to Christianize the followers of Mohammed, defeats its own purpose; for, in a population such as that of European Turkey, consisting of nine distinct races, professing four extremely dissimilar creeds, foreign religious interference only serves to widen the chasm which already separates them, and to open a way for the easy admission of the political intrigues which are the immediate, real, and permanently-operating cause of all the troubles of that now unfortunate country. The reforms of Selim III. were carried so far, in the French direction, as to have earned for him the name of Socialist He was not satisfied with modelling the Turkish army on the plan of the French, and altering, essentially, Mohammedan institutions, in many other respects, to suit the notions he had imbibed of what was necessary to constitute a liberal system of government, but he adopted Western domestic customs, and habits, and manners; and a large measure of toleration for other creeds; thereby demonstrating, to as great an extent as it is possible to desire, the facility with which Mohammedanism may be superceded, if left to its own spontaneous processes of development. If the progress of the change has been slow, we may ask, how much this has been owing to the mutual hatred and intolerance engendered among the races and religious communities, by the hostile and conflicting interference of the three Christian Powers. In place of a continuous infusion of the elements of discord, and a studious policy to set Greek against Ottoman, and the Christians against the believers in Islamism, how much better would it have been to have encouraged an amalgamation of all the different races into one, by maintaining the independence of the Porte, and the dignity of the Sultan. The remarks of

"A Traveller in Italy," are addressed in a most pointed manner, to the suicidal policy which is still pursued in the East. And we express less astonishment, that Russia should indulge and encourage a procedure so reprehensible, because it exactly suits her purposes of aggression. But British interests are, clearly, so incompatible with British diplomacy—the weakening of the weaker powers, is so directly destructive of the balance of power—and the great increase, to the increasing preponderance of France, in the affairs of Turkey is seemingly so prolific of future dissensions, that we feel at a loss how to account for the infatuation with which British councils have been surrounded.

Connected with this subject, a pamphlet which has appeared in Paris, recommending a Peace Congress, might have been included in the list of publications mentioned at the head of this article. Various rumors ascribe this production to the Emperor; while, on the other hand, care has been taken to disabuse the public mind of any impression by which it may be supposed that he is the author. The presumption, notwithstanding, that he is identified with it, in some shape or other, bears a considerable degree of probability, if the tenor of its recommendations be taken in connection with the well-known feeling of the Emperor on the subject of peace, and his previously declared opinion, which is now assumed to have referred to a Congress, when he said: "Let Europe decide and declare who is in the right and who is in the wrong, for that will be a grand step towards a solution." The interest of France is obviously to leave open the contingencies on which Turkish difficulties could be renewed at some future day. Unlike England, she has nothing to lose in that quarter of the world, but everything to gain. The chances of making progress in the East, and balancing there, for her own ends, the opposition of Russia and England for the possession of the high road to India, are strong inducements to have the terms of peace so determined that she may have an opportunity of playing a prominent part there. Now, a general Congress is the very means by which this object could be best served. If they could not, as at the Vienna Congress, partition the territories of the weaker Powers among the stronger, they might be able, as at the Congress of Verona, to decide on the perpetration of some base act, which would afterwards have to be undone, but not before the expenditure of a similar amount of blood and treasure. But as to any permanent good which, under present circumstances, could result from a general Peace Congress, the prospects are altogether discouraging. The author of the French pamphlet, whoever he is, recommends no particular terms or conditions according to which the negotiations for peace should be undertaken. No line of policy is even hinted at; nothing, in short, is held out to justify the calling together the plenipotentiaries of the several Governments; and without some previous understanding, some known definite object to be served by it, there is no reason to think that the proceedings or conclusions of a general Congress would give satisfaction. One safe course is open, and however difficult it may be now to enter it, after the series of errors which have been committed, it is the only one which, in the end, will be found to secure the British possessions against the cupidity and aggressive views of Russia or any other Power. We conceive that the promulgation and adoption of a policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of foreign countries, based on guarantees for the integrity and independence of the territorial limits of the existing European dynasties, would answer all the ends and give all the security, concerning which much uneasiness and anxiety has been experienced. With this previous and definite understanding, a general Congress would form the proper and legitimate instrument for the ratification of a peace concluded on corresponding terms.

The balance of power requires that the central members of the confederation should specially be protected. Without such protection, and the most ample guarantee for the permanent security of their territories, they cannot be independent; and without independence, the balance of power cannot exist. Peace and national independence, should be made paramount to the propagation of revolutionary doctrines; and nations should be guaranteed the right to work out spontaneously their own amelioration. The Austrian form of government, certainly has no resemblance to that of France, but each is adapted equally to the genius and circumstances of its own people; and, therefore, should be tolerated, and, by courtesy, should be respected; for a despotic democracy is as obnoxious to true freedom, as the most absolute form of monarchial government. In making these remarks, it is impossible to avoid a condemnation of the demands made, by England and France, on the Sultan, with reference to an amelioration of the condition of his Christian subjects. The same species of interference that was attempted with the Protestant subjects of Austria. On this head, the *North British Review*, and "a Traveller in Italy," make the following appropriate remarks:—

"Nor have we (says the Review) greatly mended matters, by announcing that one of our objects is to secure for the subject races of Turkey the recognition of their civil rights, and the amelioration of their social condition. Our steps in this direction have obtained us the dislike of the Turkish Government, without gaining us the confidence of the Turkish people. The Government knows that what we demand would be the death-knell of its supremacy; the latter feel that what they want is not better treatment, but emancipation from Ottoman rule. To the Mussulman—one million of foreigners to ten millions who abhor him—we say: 'You shall govern mildly and justly.' To the Greek Christian—ambitious, restless, and full of wild aspirations for independence—we say: 'You must submit to this hated foreign dominion, for it suits our views of political equilibrium to perpetuate it.' How can either Mussulman or Christian be expected to recognize us as real friends?"

"This policy (says the Traveller in Italy) will plunge us continually deeper and deeper into a labyrinth of confusion and of crime; for while one hand is raised to resist Russia, we must be prepared to use the other to keep liberty prostrate; yet so little do our statesmen appreciate the difficulty and danger of such a position, that, thinking to consolidate the power of Turkey, they have insisted on the amelioration of the condition of its Christian subjects, and thus unconsciously enforce its suicide. Can our Ministers be so ignorant of human nature *as to suppose that the improvements applicable to a native despotism will prove a remedy for a foreign domination?* It is not the degree of oppression that creates the desire for independence; on the contrary, a people may be so degraded by oppression, that if they but feel and can escape the lash, they have no aim or hope beyond; but if their condition be improved, it will elevate their moral and intellectual character, and then, however little they may be galled by oppression, they will desire independence for its own sake."

It may not be too late to inaugurate a different international policy. But repentance must precede reformation; and it may be doubted if Lord Palmerston, who is at the helm of affairs, would brook to take a course contradictory of all his antecedents. Yet without some change formally agreed upon and officially promulgated, we can see no method by which to withdraw Austria from her present neutral position; and without an Austrian alliance, there seems no possibility

of escaping, with honor, from our present difficulties, nor security against a recurrence of the cause which has occasioned the present war. A non-interference policy, with territorial guarantees, would exclude English propagandism from Austria; but it would also keep French bayonets out of Italy and Turkey. This facility of interference is, as we have said, the cause of all our present difficulties, and is now the fruitful nursery in which English and French statesmen are raising up in Turkey the seeds of future European disorganisation.

This is not the place to argue the respective claims of dynasties and nationalities. What concerns us most is the preservation of the balance of power, and, through that, the safety of our possessions in India. If it can be shewn, as we think it can, that without the independence of Austria, that balance cannot be maintained, and that by our endangering that independence we forced Austria to take up a neutral position, defensive, in reality, of the territories of our antagonist, there can remain no question as to the line of policy which it is necessary to choose. Tampering with nationalities has been long enough practised to satisfy any one not wholly ignorant of the alpha-beta of Italian, Austrian, and Turkish history, that it is the game of despots, and never yet has produced an example of a people benefited by it. When, by the decree of a general congress and the language and spirit of diplomacy, the principle of non-interference, religious and secular, in the internal affairs of other countries shall have become an acknowledged fact, and the actual territorial limits of each shall have been mutually guaranteed, we may then, under a balance of power so regulated, expect to see Austria possess independence sufficient to resist Russian aggression. But till then the balance of power can be nothing else than nominal, a game at fast and loose, in which the weaker powers are coerced into the intrigues of the greater. An accusation of faithlessness and treachery against Austria, under present circumstances, may gratify the popular taste, and ward off for a time the responsibility which, sooner or later, must be met, but it cannot improve the false position in which we are placed; and the sooner we prepare ourselves to look with candor at the true cause of Austria's neutrality, notwithstanding that, in doing this, we may trace that cause to the revolutionary propensities of some of our own statesmen, so much sooner will we be able to retrace our steps, and to bring about a state of affairs more satisfactory, in itself, and more conducive to the ends which it is our desire to accomplish.

Annual Report of the Normal, Model, Grammar, and Common Schools in Upper Canada, for the year 1854. By the Chief Superintendent of Schools.

As a source of information to the Government and the country, on the management, the cost, and the condition of the schools, the Annual Report is an important document. It is the only official index, to which there is access, for the facts of what has been done for the cause of education during each year. It should therefore present, in as clear and exact a form as possible, a separate account for each department, and these separate accounts should be so prepared that the average attendance compared with the gross expense would give the rate at which the country pays for each child attending school. Of course, abstracts of the reports of local superintendents, correspondence, official communications, &c., are understood to form part of the contents; but the chief summary is that which would enable us to see at a glance what the country pays, directly and indirectly, for the school attendance of each child. On examining the Report for 1854, we find it impossible to arrive at this information; and consequently have to remain ignorant of the leading fact connected with the subject of common schools. The mixing up, besides, of common, private, and grammar schools, and colleges and universities, in the manner which, we see, it has been done in this Report, has a tendency to conceal the results of the common schools altogether. A Report embracing statistics of all the educational establishments in the Province would be proper if it came from a member of the Government, holding a seat in the Cabinet, and representing the department of education; but from a superintendent of common schools the proceeding is, in our opinion, perfectly irregular. The more so because private schools, academies, colleges and universities being sectarian, cannot be made amenable to a school system that imposes uniformity of belief. If the system of centralisation is to extend to a supervision of sectarian schools and colleges, as now attempted, a very important change will have to be made in that irresponsible body called the Council of Public Instruction. It would, in short, have to be abolished; and the creation of a Government Department under a responsible Cabinet Minister will become necessary. Everything appears to conspire, now, to favor such a consummation. Had the school system been such as to satisfy the diversified tastes and beliefs of a mixed population, and the Chief Superintendent's duties been confined simply to the execution of details, such a change might not come to be required. But, with a Chief Superintendent, and a Council of Public Instruction, privileged by Government to employ every means to denounce and repudiate the true Protestant principle on which private schools and colleges are founded, it is but justice that, for the protection of the interests of these sectarian schools and colleges, the educational department should be made one of responsibility. In the meantime, and with reference to the Report for 1854, the inclusion of sectarian schools under a non-sectarian supervisorship is an anomaly of rather a suspicious character. For whether the object aimed at is to depreciate more effectually the public character of these private schools, or to conceal the common school results, the confusion produced by mixing together two things that have no connexion betokens some design not altogether right. A practical person could easily have procured and arranged the statistical returns, so as to give the net average cost of instructing each child attending the common schools. The credit side of the common school account should show the amounts paid on account of, 1st, School Houses and Lots; 2d, Normal and Model Schools; 3d, Libraries, Maps, and Apparatus; 4th, Teachers' Salaries; 5th, Salaries of Chief and Local Superintendents; 6th, Education Office and Council of Public Instruction; 7th, Insurance of School Houses, Libraries, Apparatus, &c.; 8th, Interest and loss on sale of Debentures; 9th, Journal of Education, Annual Report, Special Correspondence, and whatever other contingencies, such as Gas, Water, and Fuel, come under the head of School Expenditure. The yearly cost should include the whole sum paid for the erection of buildings, for lots, rents, furniture, fuel, interest, and all such items as would go to make up the gross expense of supporting a private school. The amount so stated, if divided by the num-

ber of pupils on the average roll of attendance, would show the cost of the instruction given to each. This summary has not, however, been given; and the data supplied is partial, both in respect to the common schools and other private seminaries; so that it is not possible to ascertain the cost of each pupil, either in the common schools, private schools, colleges, or universities.

The number of children of school age in Upper Canada is stated at 277,912, and the average attendance 92,925.

The Reports from the local superintendents are by no means satisfactory, either as regards the character of the schools or of the teachers. On this head the complaints appear to be very general, as will be seen by such remarks as the following:—

"Good teachers are becoming more and more scarce among us. Our schools have, with difficulty, been supplied for the current year; and some of those employed are not the most capable. Nothing but the offer of increased salaries will induce the most efficient teachers to continue with us, and the people are very unwilling to raise them. I cannot say that education is making any progress in this quarter."—*The Rev. John McMorine, Rumsay.*

"I regret to say that the interest felt on the subject of education in this township is decidedly on the wane; and until the penalties imposed upon worthless trustees are made heavier than at present, the interests of education will languish. The mere loss of the amounts of legislative grant and municipal assessment (if required) of the trustees is disregarded; they pay it cheerfully, and pocket money by their neglect, as their taxes for a school, in many cases, far exceed the amount that can be levied off them if they close the school against the section."—*The Reverend John A. Mulock, Fredericksburgh.*

"The operations of our schools for the Township of Richmond, for the past year, have not been characterized by that efficiency which the friends of education and general improvement would have desired. In some of our schools, however, a marked improvement is to be seen, but in others retrogression is apparent, developing an almost criminal apathy on the part of those whose province it is to be foremost in pushing forward this noble enterprise. One very great drawback to a progressive movement in this department is the want of *efficient* teachers. This arises from various causes. It may be seen in the want of encouragement, by way of remuneration, so that young men of promise are induced to seek other employment; this is brought about, either by an utter disregard to the claims of education; a miserly selfishness; a limited sense of duty; or a crippled state of ability, caused by local dissensions and illiberal sectional legislation. Another source of inefficiency is to be found in the system of licensing—some parties, through favoritism, or the failing to appreciate the responsibilities involved in their position, have granted certificates to those whose qualifications did not warrant it; this will especially apply to third-class certificates—a class that should be entirely abolished, for no one, unless under peculiar circumstances, should be allowed to assume the office of teaching who holds no higher qualification."—*E. A. Dunham, Esq., Richmond.*

"The schools are not in as flourishing a condition as I would wish, owing, in a great measure, to the trustees in many of the sections employing insufficient teachers, and then changing often, and sometimes, if they cannot engage a 'cheap master,' closing their schools for six or eight months.—*The Rev. E. G. Anderson, Tyendinaga.*

"The scarcity of school teachers is very much felt in this Township, and renders our excellent school system less productive of good than it otherwise would be. I readily admit that our present school law is superior to any other of which I have any knowledge; but from the large number of children reported not attending school, I am inclined to believe it is yet defective."—*John R. Clark, Esq., Haldimand.*

"The present school law seems, as a whole, to work very well, and to offer every facility for the establishment of good schools in each and every section, would the community but properly appreciate its spirit, and endeavour to carry out to the letter the provisions of the Act. This, however, is a desideratum as yet far from being realized, and as far from being accomplished. But understand me not to say that this is the fault of the system, for I believe, Sir, you have done everything in your power to perfect it. I think it is not hard to find the defect, and even to place our finger upon the spot, in fact it may be summed up in one word, '*incompetent teachers.*' Now, Sir, we have a Normal School, and one that is doing much to remedy and remove the evil; but I never knew a greater dearth of teachers than at the present, and *such teachers*, only a sprinkling of them have ever seen the inside of a Normal School or any other regular institution of learning. Nor is it the fault of the examining board, or of trustees, that we have incompetent teachers. It would seem that, from some cause or other, the more active portion of the young men who leave the Normal School soon abandon the profession of teaching, perhaps for business of a more lucrative or less fluctuating character; and this, I fear, will continue to be the case until some more efficient means be adopted to raise the standard of education among us."—*Jonathan Wolverton, Esq., M.D., Grimsby.*

"I am happy to say that the schools here are all progressing very satisfactorily in every point except one, a rather essential one, namely, the very frequent change of teachers, and for which I see no especial remedy. Few contracts are made for more than three months, and seldom extend over six. I need not point out to you, sir, the disadvantage this must be to the pupils; for although the teachers may have been educated at the Normal School, yet every one has a system or mode of his own: besides, on this frontier position many of our teachers are from the United States, or having received their education there, bring in a different manner and pronunciation."—*John Radcliff, Esq., Thorold.*

"I have made several visits and examinations in the school sections of this township during the present year, and am sorry to say I have found the schools in a very imperfect state. As the free school system has been introduced, however, they are now on a better footing than before."—*Daniel Donaghue, Esq., Ennismore.*

"Indeed the cause of education is suffering severely in every section of the country with which I am acquainted, from the want of a sufficient number of properly qualified teachers; and this state of affairs will not only continue to exist, but must increase until the standard of the teacher's salary is materially raised."—*Edward F. Weeks, Esq., Elmsley South, Co. of Leeds.*

"Including 48 children in the Pickering portion of the union section of Pickering and Scarboro', there are 1248 children of school age, resident within the limits of the eleven school sections in Scarboro', of whom 832, or between 66 and 67 per cent., attend school, and 416, or between 33 and 34 per cent., do not."—*William Robert Morgan, Esq., Scarboro'.*

"With respect to the township of Essa, I am sorry to report that very little progress has been made in the efficiency of the schools during the past year; this has been owing to the difficulty of procuring teachers, and to the disposition evinced by trustees of changing their teachers, and of teachers to try some new scene of action. From these causes some of the schools have been closed for several months, although the trustees have used every exertion in their power to procure suitable teachers, to whom they were willing to pay a liberal stipend."—*Thomas Drury, Esq., Essa, &c.*

"I have obtained very little information from the reports of the trustees, regarding the causes of non-attendance at school—the one most generally given is that they were kept at home to work. The causes that have appeared most prevalent to myself, are a positive indifference to, or a very inadequate apprehension of, the blessings of education; the high price of labor, and the consequent temptation to employ the young at a very early age in agricultural and other labors. Much, also, depends upon the efficiency of the teacher and the character and energy of the trustees. The evil might, to some extent, be remedied by the formation of evening schools, and the establishment of evening lectures on scientific and other interesting subjects."—*The Rev. John Gray, Orillia, &c.*

"The present school law, and school system, are doing great things, in improving the intellects, and I trust also the hearts of the rising youth of Upper Canada. It is, however, to be deeply regretted that all the children of school age are not scholars. The report shows that somewhat more than one-fourth of the school population has attended no school during the year."—*The Rev. John Armour, Esquesing.*

"If, from the number of children of school age in this township (which, exclusive of those in part sections, is 1595), we take the whole number on registers, 1183, we find 412, or more

than one-fourth, have not found their way to any school during the year. Again, if from the number on registers we take the mean average of attendance, 612, we find a deficiency in attendance of 562. In other words, that those who have been at school have attended only a little more than half time. All of which show that but a fraction more than one-third of the children of school age have been in actual attendance at school at any one time during the year—certainly a state of things far from being desirable."—*The Rev. James Nisbet, Trafalgar.*

"The schools in this township are very backward; but as some of them are adopting the free school system in part this year, we may hope to find some entirely free next year; and thus find a prospect of their redemption."—*Andrew Wilson, Esq., Caistor.*

"The condition of the schools generally in this township, I am sorry to say, is not a very prosperous one; though in some cases matters go on very well. In some sections the slowness of progress is in a great measure owing to the mismanagement of trustees, and a consequent carelessness on the part of parents and guardians of children whether the schools be kept open or not. Many of the schools, however, were taught by efficient teachers last year, with very favorable results. At present the prospect is gloomy, four schools now lying idle for want of teachers."—*William Hurswell, Esq., Sencca.*

"The free schools have declined in this township; the mixed system of capitation tax on scholars and rate upon property is general, and likely to be universal."—*James Covernton, Esq., Charlotteville.*

"One of the most serious difficulties which the cause of education has to contend with in this township, is the great scarcity of well qualified and thorough teachers. To obtain first-class teachers has been almost out of the question; and I deeply regret that my report shows so many third-class."—*J. A. Backhouse, Esq., Walshingham.*

"Two circumstances are operating unfavorably for the interests of education at present, in these townships. The first is a deficiency in the supply of good teachers. Several schools have continued vacant for a considerable time during the past year, from this cause, the trustees being most anxious to procure good teachers; and in several instances willing to increase their usual allowance to procure them. Another thing that operates materially against the interests of education in these townships is the injudicious arrangement of the school sections."—*Robert Brydon, Esq., Damfries North, &c.*

"The schools in the township of Wilmot are not in such a satisfactory state, as from the flourishing state of the country in general might be expected. Good teachers are scarce, and will continue to be so, until the salaries are brought up to a higher figure. Only six schools out of 22 were kept open the whole year; six from seven to nine months, and ten for only six months. The highest salary paid is $25 per month, and this is only in two instances. It is my humble opinion the schools in this township will always remain in a sickly condition, so long as it is optional with the inhabitants to raise the teachers' salaries by tax or rate bill."—*Martin Rudolph, Esq., Wilmot.*

"A very great scarcity of teachers is felt in my district, and several schools are now vacant."—*John Cadenhead, Esq., North Riding, Wellington County.*

"In reference to the schools under my superintendency during the last year, I have to say there are many drawbacks to their efficiency. First, the frequency with which teachers are changed in almost every school section. Secondly, the irregularity of attendance, which can be seen where the disproportion between the average attendance and the number of names on the school register is taken into consideration.—*Archibald Currie, Esq., Mosa, &c., Middlescx County.*

"In regard to the general welfare of the schools, I would remark, that the power given to the township councils to alter the boundaries of sections without the consent of a majority of the inhabitants, has a very injurious effect. I have pleasure in reporting an increase in teachers's salaries; yet teachers are scarce even at the present high rate of remuneration. Several schools in Malahide, for this reason, have been vacant some time."—*The Rev. Edmund Sheppard, Dorchester South, &c., Middlesex County.*

"I am sorry to state that there were only six of the thirteen sections into which this township is divided, with schools in operation during the past year, and most of these only part of the time. This was partly owing to the impossibility of procuring competent teachers, although the trustees were in most cases willing to give a higher salary than was formerly offered in this part of the country."—*William Paterson, Esq., Sombra, County of Lambton.*

"I am sorry to state that the affairs of the schools were found at the commencement of this year in a very unsatisfactory state—the board as yet not being aware of the whole amount of liabilities remaining unsettled; and in respect to the management last year, the results by no means correspond with the amount of money expended."—*James Anderson, Esq., Port Hope.*

"We regret to return you so great a number who attend no school; and it is difficult to see how to remedy the evil, unless a room be opened and appropriated to this class alone; but this plan (although it has been talked of,) would be attended with some difficulty, which the trustees are not at present prepared to meet."—*The Rev. James Cooper, Woodstock.*

"In forwarding the annual report, I regret exceedingly that I cannot, unless at the expense of truth, give a more flattering account of the state of education in this locality."—*John Stewart, Esq., Stratford.*

I must say, in behalf of this village, as accounting for the unsatisfactory condition it appears to be in, as regards educational advancement, that it was last year only that it underwent incorporation from a portion of Sandwich into a village."—*S. S. Macdonell, Esq., M.A., Windsor.*

"I regret much having to remark of the populous township of Charlottenburg, that within a fraction of the one-half of the whole number of children, from the ages of five and sixteen, never go to school at all."—*The Rev. John McLaren, Charlottenburgh.*

"The schools generally, in this township, are in a backward state, owing to the inferior teachers employed."—*The Rev. John R. Meade, Lochiel.*

"I cannot refrain from remarking, that, although my experience is very limited, the greatest injury which the cause of education has to sustain, is owing to the inefficiency as well as the unsettled character of the teacher. These evils are, I conceive, the result of the miserable remuneration they receive for their services, the want of houses attached to the respective schools to lodge them in, and, above all, the insecurity of their situation. Their liability to be removed every year renders them careless and indifferent; and the emolument which they derive from their professional labours is not sufficient to stimulate them to extend the sphere of their knowledge. This township is at present suffering severely from the consequence of this state of disorganisation. The teacher is not respected; for in many cases he does not deserve respect. He is in his own turn discontented; no progress is made; and the school is closed, only to be opened again with hesitation and fear, succeeded by despair. Pupils and parents are dissatisfied; and the object of the school act is in a great measure nullified."—*The Rev. J. A. Morris, Fitzroy.*

The importance of these extracts, as official evidences of the deplorable condition of the schools, occasioned by the bad quality of the teachers, will account for our admitting them so extensively in our pages. The proofs are abundant, that the teachers, who follow the profession, are those holding third-class certificates; and that such as have attained the second or first class, on leaving the Normal School, generally betake themselves to other means of getting a livelihood, after having been, in great part, educated and boarded at the public expense. One prominent fact is noticeable throughout all the correspondence of the local superintendents, and to this we are desirous to draw attention, more particularly as it supplies a criterion by which to determine the first and most important condition, to which we are to look for the formation of a good school. The local reports agree in this particular fact, that wherever there is a bad school, it is uniformly found that the teacher is bad; and, on the other hand, that wherever the teacher is competent, the school is always prosperous and well filled. If the Annual Report is of less value than it might have been, had it contained the gross expenditure of the common schools, it is still valuable on account of the

opportunity which it affords, of ascertaining a general fact from a multiplicity of practical and reliable witnesses, who all express one sentiment, the result of their personal experience. What, however, is remarkable, is the circumstance that, while they show bad schools to be a consequence of bad teachers, they fail to indicate the proper remedy, and to point to the Normal School as the responsible department. In place of this,—in place of making the Normal School responsible, many of the local superintendents recommend penal enactments, such as would make attendance and all other business of the schools compulsory. They recommend that the municipal system of self-government, which is now partially applicable in the management of the schools, in so far, at least, as the municipalities have a choice of means by which to raise funds, should be superseded by a central governing power; and thus, in a free country, to add another link to the despotism of the present school law, against which more than one-half the population of Canada has been protesting. As this is a point of material consequence, indicating the extreme lengths and absurdities to which a secession from right principles is always sure to lead, and will have to be referred to frequently in our future discussions on the anomaly of attempting to graft one of the worst features of despotism on municipal self-government, we extract here a few examples of the recommendations of the local superintendents :—

"I say then, let a tax be levied by our Legislature upon the entire property of the country for the education of its youth, and thus put an end to the constant jarring, bickering, and ill-feeling in school sections on the subject of 'free schools.' * * * * A law should also be enacted rendering it imperative upon parents or guardians to send the youth, under their charge, to school for some certain and reasonable period."—*Edward F. Weeks, Esq., Elmsley, South, County of Leeds.*

"I know, that as a practical man, you have to deal with things as they are, and not as we think they should be, or as we should wish them to be; but I perceive you design using your influence (as, I may say, I think justly) to procure a Legislative enactment to make education in some degree compulsory."—*The Rev. John Bell Worrell, Elmsley, North, County of Lanark.*

"Much as we have to admire in the present school law,—and indeed so far as I am competent to decide, it is far more perfect than human institutions generally are,—yet something more is required to make education not of a secondary, but of paramount importance. And the more I ponder the progress of education in this part of the country the more I am convinced that a more stringent law is required to force an ample provision for its support and advancement, and render *imperative* the maintainance of a system that must assuredly be beneficial to every free country."—*John J. Watson, Esq., Adolphustown, County of Lennox.*

"I rejoice to hear that measures are about to be adopted to require, as far as possible, parents and guardians to send their children to school."—*The Rev. John A. Mulock, Fredericksburgh, County of Lennox.*

"Our common school system will not have assumed perfection until the property tax be the *only* mode of sustaining its operations, and coercive measures be adopted to secure universal attendance: these provisions, with competent teachers, cannot fail in giving character to our educational efforts, which otherwise can scarcely be attained."—*E. A. Dunham, Esq., Richmond, County of Lennox.*

"Doubtless, if parents can be got to attend, school lectures will contribute in time to remove this absurd idea; but some law which would compel parents to send, or pay for their children whether or not, would no doubt work efficiently."—*The Rev. J. Gilbert Armstrong, B.A., Etobicoke, &c., County of York.*

"It certainly would not be amiss to adopt stringent measures to compel those who are positively careless to send their children a part of the year."—*The Rev. Aaron Slaght, Jun., Townsend, County of Norfolk.*

"I am of opinion, if the state makes the property of all liable to be taxed for the support of free schools, that where such exist, it should be made imperative to participate in their advantages."—*Archibald Campbell, Esq, Caradoc, County of Middlesex.*

"I have no doubt that a measure compelling parents and guardians to send the children under their charge regularly to school is the only remedy for an evil which is so general; and would prove of incalculable benefit to the rising generation."—*Archibald Currie, Esq., Mosa, &c., County of Middlesex.*

Now before commenting on the purport of these extracts, let us not forget that we are Protestants and in the enjoyment of municipal freedom; that we profess to hold on by the doctrine of liberty of conscience which was the principle of the Protestant Reformation, and by Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights which constitute the basis of British liberty; that while we are opposed, on the one hand, to the Papal doctrine of uniformity of belief and practice, we avow the same measure of hostility, on the other, against all unwarantable interference, with our corporate liberties, whether that interference come from the selfwill of the monarch or the licentiousness of the democracy. Mr. Campbell says, with a semblance of truth which is deceptive, in one of the above extracts, that where free schools are made compulsory, the attendance should also be made compulsory. But he does not stand alone in the adoption of this method of reasoning; for we find the advocates of free schools advancing generally the same argument. Erroneous premises here as in other cases, lead to erroneous conclusions. Of course, if the legislature can be got to violate the spirit of constitutional liberty so far as to place a tyrannical act on the statute book, it will have to follow up that one act with others of a similar, tyrannical character, before that the first can be made to take effect. This is a necessary consequence of legislative attempts to combine the genius of institutions which are in their natures essentially antagonistic. By the same process of reasoning, those who advocate compulsory attendance as a counterpart to compulsory "free schools," would justify the law of England, in olden times, by which every one within the realm was compelled to attend the Government Church on Sunday; because every one was equally taxed for the maintainance of said Church. This law, though obsolete, in practice has never been repealed. It is still on the statute book. But we do not find, at the present day, the Government compelling attendance on the services of the Government Church in England or Ireland; because the principle of a Government Church has got into disrepute, and the connection between Church and State is therefore in process of dissolution. There was a time, however, when every one in England was taxed for the Church, in like manner as, in Canada, it is now sought to tax every one alike for the whole maintainance of the schools. If it was wrong, in the one case, wherein is it right in the other? They are parallel cases; and consistency requires that, in sustaining one, the other must be sustained, or both must fall to the ground. The fault is in the premises. As in the case of the Church, so in that of the school, the error is in the assumed justification of the right to impose taxes for their support. Carry the parallelism farther, and we find the same motives adduced to justify the right of imposition. The object of the Church was the preservation of the religious morals of the nation. The object of the School is the promotion of the secular morals of the people. Now it cannot be maintained that the secular morals should come more intimately under the fostering care and protection of the State than the reli-

gious. On the contrary, religion, as the basis of all morality, strips secularism of its pretensions, when brought into comparison, as is here manifest. So that if there should be a preference, if the State can be assumed to be justified in taking upon itself the duty of guarding and advancing public morality by educational means, then are the Churches the proper means to be employed, as there can be no public morals which do not spring from a religious sentiment. Pushing the argument of the free school advocates to its extreme length, this is the issue at which we arrive. For ourselves we are opposed to the State taking upon itself the management of either churches or schools, because we believe, and are able to assign reasons for our belief, that religious and secular education are more prosperous when left to the voluntary efforts of those who choose to engage in the work. Special or annual grants, when distributed, without partiality, among the different school organisations of a people, and without reference to sectarian or non-sectarian differences of system, cannot fail to have a good effect. It is not to any assistance, great or small, from the public revenue, for educational purposes, that we would object; but to the State taking the management into its own hands; and controlling the details, even to the very routine of the school room.

There is another ground, however, on which the advocates of compulsion assume the right of the State to the exclusive management of the schools; namely, the prevention of vice. It is said that secular education prevents crime. That a knowledge of writing, arithmetic, and accounts, because they qualify for the business of commercial life, enable the individual to procure a livelihood, and thereby are a means to restrain from the commission of immoral acts. This is a very popular doctrine in Massachusetts, and also in Canada. If there is one lesson in the catechism of school quackery more current than another, it is this. For illustrative proof of its truth we are told to look to the police reports and to the jail records. No doubt these documents furnish evidence of a painful nature, as to the extent to which depravity in the lower ranks of life is a component part of the social system. But are we to look no farther? Is the first act of petty theft, by an unbefriended orphan boy, who has been cast early to seek his bread in the alleys and back lanes of a city,—the more heinous offence of the youth who has become hardened by criminal associations, —and the depravity of the parent whom dissipation and its accompanying vices may have made the constant inmate of a prison, to be held up, to our notice, as comprising the whole sphere of immorality and crime? This is rather a narrow view of the evils which have been connected with the educational question. For it touches only to the criminality of that part of the population which has not had the benefit of secular teaching. It has never occurred to the advocates of compulsion in school matters, it would seem, to enquire if the amount of vice and crime, on the part of the secularly educated classes, is, or is not, greater than is shown, by the police and jail returns, to exist in the lower ranks of life. Yet there is no truth more completely established, by those whose avocations make them cognisant of the circumstances on which it is founded, than that the proper theatres for the exhibition of crime, and vice, and demoralisation, on a large scale, are, what are called, the civil courts. The greatest villanies, and the aggregate of cases, reported in the daily newspapers, are of a commercial character, wherein the acquisitions of secular education play a conspicuous part, and shine out in bold relief. It is not our intention to go into this part of the subject, at this time. We merely refer to it here because it has some connection with the previous question which we have been discussing. It is evident, however, that if the perjury and fraud of the civil courts be estimated at their true value, they will far outweigh any thing which can be produced from police and jail returns.

How much more reasonable it would have been, on the part of the local superintendents, had they prescribed a remedy more in accordance with the facts which they have elicited, than have travelled out of their way to make suggestions, which are only a sequence to a previous erroneous assumption. They complain of the scarcity of good teachers, and the overabundance of bad ones, with third class certificates; and to these evils they impute the bad condition of the schools. Why not, then, in accordance with these positive facts, fix the responsibility on the Normal School? They have not, it is true, done so; but the omission, in no way, exonerates it from impeachment. The facts stated, in the local reports, are before the public. They are all of one tenor. There is no difference of opinion respecting the bad state of the schools. They all trace the evil to the same cause,—the badness of the teachers.

In reply to the charge against the religious basis of the Canadian school system, that it was imported from Massachusetts, Dr. Ryerson says :—"It has also been objected, that our school system has been adopted from that established in the State of Massachusetts, the tendency of which is alleged by the objectors to be irreligious. I reply that the religious features of our school system have been derived from the Irish National School system." Now this statement is true; or it is not true. A great deal depends on the decision of this point. It is, in short, the pivot on which the whole question of secular, opposed to combined secular and religious education, turns. A mass of official evidence has been produced to prove that the religious basis of the Canadian school act is that of Massachusetts. That evidence has not been taken up and disposed of piece-meal, nor has it been replied to in any shape. Yet Dr. Ryerson presumes that a simple negative put forth in the Annual Report, to be circulated afterwards in the Journal of Education, and to appear in all correspondence issuing from the Education Office, will, in the eyes of his readers, meet that evidence. This calculation has been based, evidently, on the power of a Government Engine, supplied with unlimited means, to curb the public press; and the irresponsibility of the Office of Chief Superintendent. There is too much intelligence, however, abroad for this game to be played off any longer; and with the evidence before us, supplied by the local superintendents, it is time that the Education Office should be brought to account for its sins of omission as well as of commission; and that the Chief Superintendent be made responsible to public opinion. It may not be generally known that this officer is not responsible to the people's representatives;—that he is beyond their control. The question may not have occurred to those who approve of the principles of representation and responsible government, why every department and every public officer should be responsible to parliament, except the Educational Department and the Chief Superintendent, who are not. We boast of municipal government, and yet, unconsciously, tolerate a huge tyranny and one of the worst features of despotism in our midst; for what is more powerful, for evil as well as good, and less capable of being resisted,

than a gigantic and irresponsible Government Press. The common school act makes the Chief Superintendent responsible to the Govenor General only. This is not in unison with the principle of our government. It is an exception to, and a violation of the hard earned system of responsible government which we now enjoy. One of its tendeneies may be seen in the use which Lord Elgin made of the Educational department to maintain his popularity, aud trumpet his fame abroad; while the Chief Superintendent, in return for this service, was secured in the unmolested enjoyment of the most absolute discretionary power over the consciences and liberties of all classes, without distinction, in the Province. We do not find fault with the harmony which subsisted between the late Governor General and the Chief Superintendent, farther than the school interests suffered from the compact between them, and the accommodating game of "scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," which was carried on to serve the personal interests and views of each. But it may not be uninstructive to calculate the results which might spring from such a compact, under different circumstances, wherein stronger political motives might be brought into play. With all these considerations pressing on our notice, and the precise, comprehensive and conclusive evidence, respecting the state of education, supplied by the local superintendents, it is but reasonable that the Education Office should be brought to account; and the Chief Superintendent should be called on either to explain the causes or admit the facts of the discrepancies between the theory of universal education and the actual condition of the schools.

"*I reply that the religious features of our school system have been derived from the Irish National School system,*" is not a sufficient reply to the testimony which has been produced to prove the contrary. This is not a question where facts are beyond reach, and the dictum of one party or another is to pass for truth. The documents are in our possession, which show and demonstrate, without any qualification or exception whatever, that the Irish National system has, for its religious basis, the sectarian basis of the European system of education; and on the other hand, that the Canadian Government system has for its religious basis, the unsectarian basis of the school system of America. For documentary evidence of the *scctarian* prineiple of European schools, and of the *unsectarian* principle of the schools of America, as well as to elucidate the completeness of the line of demarcation between the religious basis of the school systems of the two continents, we refer our readers to Mr. Dallas' pamphlet on "the Common School System, its Principle, Operation and Results." The provision in the fourteenth section of our common school Act, that no pupils shall be required to read or receive religious lessons, to which the parents are opposed, but within this limitation they shall be allowed to receive such under certain conditions, are the features which Dr. Ryerson says are derived from the Irish National system. But this provision came into the Irish system from the Prussian. It is a part of the Prussian school law; from which the Irish Commissioners borrowed, not only this, but also the other religious features of the Irish schools, not embraced in the Canadian system. The Prussian and Irish and European common school system, contemplates and provides for the teaching of catechisms and creeds. Hence a negative provision, such as is here noticed, was indispensable to protect the religious scruples of parents. In borrowing this negative feature of a positive system we have only got its proscriptive part; for though the Canadian School Act says, "within this limitation pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instruction as their parents and guardians shall desire," yet the Journal of Education and the Annual Reports and every other influence has been so industriously exercised to check religious instruction, that we know not of a single common school, in Canada West, where a catechism or particular profession of faith is inculcated, unless it is a school which is exclusively denominational. The Irish Commissioners do not give out that their school system is exclusively secular. They do not hoist a Christian flag, and then proscribe Christian doctrinal teaching from the schools; assigning it, as is done in Canada, to the parents and the churches; on the contrary, the Commissioners, in the first place invite the clergy and laity of all denominations to assist them. They next ordain that the children in all the schools shall have opportunities of receiving religious instruction. Then the rules are prescribed for the method in which doctrinal teaching is to be carried on *by the Clergy in the School Room*. And from beginning to end, the connection, between the clergy and the schools, is made a point of paramount importance. They are not as with us, simply visitors. They enter the schools to teach their peculiar creeds. In Prussia this is done chiefly by the schoolmasters; and the reason why the regular staff of teachers in the Irish schools does not perform the same duty is because of its incompetency.

But what may suit the objects of the Irish National Board might not be suited to our circumstances; and this will appear more forcibly when we mention that the Irish National schools were not instituted for the education of the youth of Ireland, but of the inmates of workhouses and jails, and the poor who have not the means of paying for their education. As in Prussia, so the school organisation of the Irish system is under a paternal form of government, which is arbitrary and dictatorial. It is admirably fitted, we think, for the purpose which it is intended to serve, in Ireland; and the Prussian system is equally so for the circumstances of Germany, and for all governments of a paternal character. But neither would be applicable to the genius of British Constitutional liberty. We, therefore, want neither the Irish nor the Prussian system, nor any features of either. And to borrow from one or other of them is about as bad as borrowing from Massachusetts. Canadian society and circumstances vary widely from the society and circumstances of the criminals and paupers of Ireland, from the society and circumstances of Prussia, and from the society and circumstances of Massachusetts. We do not live under a paternal government. Neither do we live under a republic. Our circumstances are, therefore, as much opposed to centralisation and arbitrary principles, on the one hand, as they are to the levelling doctrines of communism, on the other.

Our Canadian school authorities appear not to have discerned the relation which subsists between principles of government and states of society, or they would not have produced such a patchwork as our Common School Act. This piece of eclecticism, we are told, has been made up by borrowing, from the State of New York, from Massachusetts, from Ireland, and from Germany. We are not aware that in England anything, in school matters, has been brought or adopted from either of these sources. School authorities there, notwithstanding the obstacles they have to contend with, occasioned by the pretensions and power of a dominant Church, do not think that anything from New York, Massachusetts, Ire-

land, or Germany, would be suitable for an English school-room. They prefer to wait and to construct, slowly but surely, from the elements and resources within the realm, some plan that will be in harmony with the principles of the government and the institutions of the country, and which will, therefore, be in its character essentially British. It is to be regretted that the Hon. S. B. Harrison was not allowed time to mature the system introduced by him in 1841. That system was British and Canadian in its character. It was practical, liberal, and free from undue Government influence. To something of the same kind we shall yet have to return.

Before leaving the subject of the Annual Report, it may not be out of place to say that our criticism of its contents has been dictated by the presumption that, like other public documents, it is amenable to public opinion; and that, differing, as we do, *in toto*, on the theories which it is made the medium of circulating, we have exercised the privilege which belongs equally to every one, exposed to their influence, of stating our objections. We would have been more pleased, if it had been possible to write in terms of commendation. But failing this, a candid exposition of the points of difference has been enunciated, by means of which, as well as of what has been advanced on the opposite side, those who incline to canvass the merits of the argument farther, may be able to do so with greater facility.

Lord Elgin's Speech at Glasgow, on the occasion of his being honored with the Freedom of the City.

After a sufficiently matured experience of colonial government, under some of its most disagreeable aspects, Lord Elgin now appears as a competitor for one of the higher offices, which are attainable by persons of rank and merit only, in the public service. The speech at Glasgow can be viewed, in no other light, than a bid for popular favor, and a setting forth of individual capacity and claims, that, it may be presumed, entitle their possessor to a place in which he can have an opportunity of gaining an honorable distinction. So far Lord Elgin's aspirations are commendable; no less on account of his practical talents and past experience, than of the advantages to be expected from their future useful employment. Being engrossed almost exclusively with the affairs of Canada, the speech is likely to excite more interest here than in any other part of British North America, or in any other portion of her Majesty's dominions. With that happy address for which Lord Elgin is distinguished, we find him, in his opening remarks, and in the conduct and management of his discourse, grouping all the little incidents which could captivate most successfully the *amor proprium* of his audience, in a manner equal to that of the best specimens of Greek and Roman eloquence. This is Lord Elgin's forte. He is, in every sense of the word, a practical statesman. He knows the sort of materials with which he has to deal; and he calculates beforehand the proper means to be used—their adaptation, their competency, and the extent to which they are to be employed in order to ensure the conditions of success. That he has succeeded in his administration of the governments of Jamaica and Canada, under peculiar circumstances, and at times when great changes and innovations had disorganized the ordinary relations of Colonial society, and to a considerable extent had suspended the functions of legislation, is the best proof that he is no ordinary person, and that, however envy or jealousy may seek to depreciate attainments that have borne fruits and carry their own external evidences, he is yet destined to take a prominent and conspicuous part in ruling the destinies of the British empire.

But, in conceding this much to the merits of our late Governor-General, it would be unfair to do so at the expense of the reputations of his predecessors. There is no positive statement, it is true, in Lord Elgin's speech at Glasgow, to imply that his allusion to the successive deaths of four Governors-General, previous to his assumption of the government of Canada, was intended, in any way, for the purpose of disparagement; and had the speech stood by itself, unconnected with the collateral remarks of other speakers, it might have borne this construction. But the Lord Provost, who opened the proceedings of the meeting with a long address, complimentary to Lord Elgin's successful career as a Colonial Governor, took occasion to make a comparison, which, though grateful to the feelings and temper of a popular assembly, under the peculiar circumstances, had a tendency to convey the impression, without taking into account the different stages of the colonial changes which had been going on, that Lord Elgin's native talents enabled him to accomplish that which had baffled and defied the utmost skill of his predecessors. That it was the part of Lord Elgin to set the Lord Provost right, and to do justice to the memories of Lord Durham, Lord Sydenham, Sir Charles Bagot, and Lord Metcalf, we think few will dispute, who are capable of appreciating the different classes of difficulties which existed in Canada, between the visit of Lord Durham and the arrival of Lord Elgin. The neglect to do this produced, consequently, an impression on the meeting, and that impression has gone abroad, to the effect, that the predecessors of Lord Elgin were comparatively deficient of that quick perception of Canadian institutions and society, which would have enabled them to control the difficulties with which they had successively to contend.

The advantage possessed by Lord Elgin, and which no previous Governor ever enjoyed, was the substance of his instructions received from Earl Grey previous to his departure for this country. These instructions were enunciated here on his arrival, and gave universal satisfaction to that portion of the people who had declared irreconcilable hostility against the exclusive principle on which the government had been previously carried on. The new mode of governing by majorities, and making the Cabinet responsible to the House of Assembly, had been long contended for, both in Upper and Lower Canada, before its adoption in 1847. The idea of a responsible government, acquired from the practice of the British Constitution, had, therefore, been fully understood here by all classes of the community, at the time of its adoption. It was not an experiment, about the failure or success of which there could be any speculation. On the contrary, there was a confidence with respect to its results, that empowered its advocates to deal with it in a manner at once familiar and practical. The comparative advantage which Lord Elgin enjoyed was the neutrality, in a manner, of the functions of the Viceroy, on all questions that divided the people in violent factions. The Governor acquired, in fact, a position of irresponsibility with regard to internal legislation. He was no longer bound to consult the interest of the dominant aristocratic class, and to submit to be led by it; nor did it become necessary that he should pursue an opposite extreme, and pander to the licentiousness of the democracy. Responsible government, under Earl Grey's instructions, placed

him in a situation whereby he was independent of both. And this position of neutrality and independence, after the asperities and disagreements, consequent on an important social change, had passed away, left Lord Elgin, at full liberty to consider the financial measures which were required to raise the credit of the Province. Compare this with the position of Lord Metcalf. Even so late as 1846, there were no instructions, from the Colonial Office, as to any precise course which would have protected the Governor from the obloquy of one or other of the factions with which he was surrounded. The only instructions were those of a general nature, which empowered all former Governors to act altogether on their own discretion, assisted, from time to time, by the conflicting advice of the Colonial Secretary. On arriving in the Province, he found a wealthy, intelligent party in possession of all the avenues leading to preferment, and of all the offices which were capable of being used as a means to control the general administration. In such a state of things there was no choice between submitting, on the one hand, to a power greater than himself, and, on the other, countenancing an opposition that had neither character nor organisation. That Lord Metcalf, like his predecessors, therefore, failed to do that which was accomplished afterwards by Lord Elgin, is not to be wondered at; nor is he deserving less of credit for having performed so little. In the same circumstances, Lord Elgin would himself have been sacrificed to the undefined and arbitrary policy which had been followed; and might have returned to England destitute of Canadian laurels, if not have been numbered as the fifth Governor-General on whom the grave had already closed.

Another part of Lord Elgin's speech is, we think, equally exceptionable; namely, that in which he marks 1850 as the year of a crisis, when Canada, previously without developed wealth, character, education, or enterprise, at one bound reached a preëminence so exalted as to eclipse, and, comparatively, throw into the shade the boasted pretensions of the United States. This is what connoisseurs in gymnastics would call "drawing a long bow." But knowing, as we do, Lord Elgin's eclectical method of preparing speeches to suit the tastes of the greatest number, at the same time, to present only that side of a subject which serves best the ends sought to be attained by popular appeals,—we are not surprised at the bold statement he ventured to set forth on this head. The reason, however, for selecting 1850 as the date of the regeneration of the Canadian race, has a meaning which many may not, at first sight, apprehend. That was the year when the Common School Act was passed and came in force, and when Lord Elgin appears to have first perceived the use which could be made of the school machinery to serve a political purpose. If we couple this discovery, and the use he made of it, with his unmitigated praise of the common school system, and in return, the unmitigated praise bestowed on him by the chief conductor of that system,—the reason for selecting the year 1850 will admit of an easy solution. Accordingly, we find, by the speech, that the contrast with the United States in favor of Canada, from that date, is made introductory to the remarks which immediately follow in praise of the school system. This connection is so studied in the speech, yet in reality so false; and the language of fulsome adulation is so contrary to the facts, that we cannot help citing the following, as a specimen of what Lord Elgin had repeated a thousand times before:—

"I do not wish to encumber you with a mass of statistical details, but among writers of all descriptions, political, statistical, and newspaper correspondents who have treated of the affairs of North America, it would be impossible to find one who, writing before 1850, does not aver that the contrast presented by Canada on one side, and the United States on the other, is most unfavourable to the former, most discouraging to those who prefer monarchical to republican institutions. Well, since 1850, there is an unanimity almost as remarkable—and the Lord Provost has adverted to that—the other way. It would be impossible to find one, I think, who does not admit that since that period the progress of Canada has been in all respects most satisfactory, equalling, if not surpassing, the most favored parts of the Union. No people have been more frank in declaration to this fact than our neighbors of the United States. I need not say to you that there is no object upon which the people of the United States are more proud than they are in reference to their system of national education, and they certainly have very good reason to be so; because while we are in this country proclaiming vociferously our zeal for popular education, and proving our sincerity by uniting to overwhelm every specific plan that is produced, there is actually in that colony in operation *a system that is elevating the intellectual standard of that people to an elevation never before attained by any community.* At the meeting of the Education Board in New York, a paper was read, representing the system of education in Canada as equal to that in Massachusetts or New York, and the President recommended the system adopted at Toronto, Canada West. I do not think it undesirable that the population of Scotland should know that there is a country not two week's sailing from Glasgow, possessing a fertile soil and a genial climate—possessing a population very like what you find in any Scottish county, sharing our views and sentiments on all questions, moral, social, political, and above all, religious, with the means of attaining education, free of cost, *and on conditions that can do violence to no principle,* on conditions attainable by every child in the community, and where every child of talent and industry may go to the highest school, where a superior education is given on the same terms, and from the superior school to the University."

The people of England, who have thus been told that we have a system of education *that is elevating our intellectual standard to an elevation never before attained by any community,* must imagine, certainly, that we are intellectual prodigies. Yet, we question much, if greater Gothamites are to be found, in any part of the world, than what are turned out of our Normal School. We only invite our readers to read the correspondence of the local superintendents contained in the last Annual Report, to satisfy themselves that Lord Elgin's language is inflated bombast, without one particle of truth. The school act of 1850, which constituted a Chief Superintendent with unlimited discretionary and arbitrary powers, and responsible only to Lord Elgin himself; which established a huge printing machinery to over-rule public opinion; and supplied means from the revenue of the Province on the most extravagant scale, to force on the people a republican system that was repulsive to their British feelings and to British usage; however it may have been made subservient to Lord Elgin's political ends, will yet remain a standing monument of the folly and the mischief of permitting private interests and personal motives to supersede the public good and the general claims of the community.

The allusion, in the above extract, to the estimate formed of our school system, by the New York Educational Board, is intended as corroborative of the tenor of the remarks which precede. The New York Board, however, formed its opinion from the perusal of a paper which had been concocted in the Education Office here, expressly for the occasion. That paper may have been prepared in the same way that Lord Elgin prepares his speeches. The New York Board had no opportunity of knowing whether it was so or not. It may have contained only part of the truth, and that part may have been so varnished as to have imposed on the Board, which was

called on to express an opinion respecting it. But we have been so much accustomed, besides, to reciprocal compliments between the parent school system in the States and its offspring in Canada, that we regard this incident in something the same light that we do the little episode of the Hon. Abbot Lawrence's son and the son of the door-keeper sitting on the same school form—which was got up, no doubt, for Canadian effect, as it forms a standing toast among our common school authorities.

Lord Elgin farther says, concerning this boasted system, that it is established "on conditions that can do violence to no principle." Immediately preceding, the Lord Provost made some remarks of a similar nature, as follows: "Canada likewise owes to his administration a boon we have not succeeded in gaining for ourselves, viz., a system of public education that in no wise intermeddles with the rights of conscience." Now, no one knew better than the late Governor-General the principle involved in the contest for separate schools. That contest continued increasing during his whole administration; and to such a height has it now arrived, that during the Parliamentary session of last year, the House of Assembly was so nearly divided on a separate school bill, that the greatest apprehensions were at the time entertained for the safety of the common school system. Lord Elgin could not have been ignorant of this fact, when he made the above statement; nor is he ignorant of the previous fact, that the objections made by the Church of Rome and the Church of England to the school system, are made on the ground of conscience. No longer ago than November last, the Committee of the Parochial Branch of the Church Society in Toronto, presented an address, from which we extract the following, to show the sentiment by which the members of the Anglican Church in Canada have always been actuated, and the ground of conscience on which, exclusively, they rest their objection:—

"The Committee of the Parochial Branch of the Church Society have, since their appointment, anxiously directed their attention to maturing a plan to provide a Scriptural Education for the younger members of the congregation under the supervision of the Clergy, convinced that the Church's mission can never be fulfilled without daily religious instruction forming an important element in her teaching.

The privilege bestowed upon the Church is to watch over her members during every period of their lives, receiving them into her fold at Baptism, and, after carefully instructing them in the divine truths contained in Holy Scripture, calling upon them to assume that responsibility which their God-parents undertook for them in infancy, and thus enabling them fully to enjoy the blessings of the Gospel covenant.

To be able to secure this object, efficient Parochial Day and Sunday Schools are necessary; for, in order to form the character of youth upon a Religious basis, it is essential that constant intercourse should be maintained between them and their clergy, which, under the present public school system, is not attainable.

The Committee feel strongly, that the education in force in the Common Schools in Western Canada, is deficient in those essential points without which education is valueless; for, while it tends to sharpen the intellect, and enable the rising generation to advance their worldly interests, it neglects to inculcate religious knowledge, which alone can make them wise unto salvation.

The Church labours under great disadvantages under the present law,—for, while their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects are allowed to have Separate Schools for their youth, and are free from taxation to support others than their own, in any place where they may consider it desirable to establish them, the United Church of England and Ireland, while equally protesting against the lax system, is denied the same privilege.

But while suffering from this injustice, the Committee cannot allow themselves to remain passive under it, and they are satisfied that the surest way to obtain an alteration of the law, is to establish efficient schools in which the younger members of our communion may be taught their duty to God, and learn to love their Mother Church, bringing their influence to bear upon public opinion in after life.

Surely this is sufficient to prove the estimate, in which the School system is held, by at least one respectable and influential section of the community; and, also, to falsify such statements as those made at the Glasgow meeting. We may add that, on the principle of conscience, the opponents of the Government system are every day acquiring fresh strength and increasing in numbers; and that while, on the one side, this state of progress is taking place, so, on the other, the backward condition of the schools, the numerous complaints on this account, and the destitution of competent teachers and superabundance of bad ones, are causes operating gradually and effectually to bring about a natural dissolution of that system respecting which Lord Elgin has taken particular pains to circulate the grossest misrepresentations.

We turn now to that part of the speech which touches on the war. Here the indications are sufficiently plain that no sympathy exists for any participation in the government of the country, while Lord Palmerston, or, at least, the present war policy, is allowed to rule in the cabinet. Lord Elgin is avowedly a peace man. He said just enough about the sword and the scabbard to put himself in good keeping with an audience composed, in part, of numbers who are in favour of prosecuting the war; but at the same time, the whole purport of his remarks is either in condemnation or ridicule of its management, and of the character of British diplomacy in connection therewith. Moreover, we are told, that the war party is in a minority; which may be a sufficient reason for such a far-seeing statesman as Lord Elgin, choosing the stronger side, and associating himself with the friends of peace.

The reference to the Vienna Note is made in a spirit of the bitterest sarcasm. Some strong motive must have influenced Lord Elgin to rake up, from the national sepulchre, this shroud of diplomatic ignorance and folly, which British statesmen had considered, was consigned to everlasting concealment. The following remarks are evidently aimed at Lord Palmerston:—

"I have no hesitation in saying, because I have seen statements made respecting my opinions on the subject—I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion Lord Palmerston and the Government, for some time past, have been carrying on this war in a manner which entitles them to the confidence and support both of those who considered the war a necessity from the commencement, and of those others, a minority certainly in the country, but still a minority embracing many respectable individuals, who wish for its vigorous prosecution now that we are entered upon it. There has been much said of late of negociations, and I earnestly hope that these negociations may turn out of some use, but I confess I am not sanguine of them. I think myself—though I should be sorry to say anything that would give offence to persons in authority, for whom I have the highest respect—that since this business began, next to the success of our arms, which we have had much reason to be thankful for, has been the failure of our diplomacy. What would now have been our position if we had succeeded in inducing Turkey to accept the proposition we made to her, contained in the famous Vienna Note, and if, after it was too late to mend the matter, we had found that we had by it secured to Russia every single thing which Prince Menschikoff originally demanded—if, in fact, the eagle of France, and the lion of Great Britain, and the wild beasts of the other countries—had been made to fence the treaty of Kamardji? And what would have been our position if afterwards we had succeeded in inducing Russia to accept the propositions she refused, and thus

left her the prestige and credit of a successful defence of Sebastopol?"

Lord Aberdeen, it is true, was premier at the time the Vienna Note was negociated, but the office of Home Secretary was filled by Lord Palmerston, and as a member of the Cabinet, he is of course held, by Lord Elgin, justly responsible for not having had sufficient discernment, however little his colleagues might have had, to see and point out the fatal blunder which was embodied in that official document.

It is not easy to fathom Lord Elgin's exact position, with respect either to the Government, or to the war. Whether he clings to the peace party, because that party is strongest and the most likely to prevail; or he foresees the probability that the present Premier will be displaced, and is lending a hand to bring about an event that would open a door for his own promotion to office, are questions that cannot be determined very nicely by the proceedings of the meeting at Glasgow. The probability, however, is, that he is influenced by both motives combined, and that he is steering a course through the rocks and quick-sands of party politics, with a view of working himself, by dint of political dexterity, into an office of emolument and to an honourable distinction. No man is better able to do this than our late Governor-General. If a good address, an earnestness of manner, a command of appropriate language, a happy method of selecting anecdotes, and, above all, a facility of adapting himself to circumstances and making the best possible use of the materials within his reach, are recommendations for the duties of statesmanship, Lord Elgin certainly possesses them all in an exalted degree. He understands well the composition of human society, that it is made up partly of honest men, but chiefly of fools and knaves. That parties and sects are so many make-weights, that can be used successfully to pull the wires of government, by any one versed in the art; and that success is less dependent on an open straight-forward course, dictated by a dogged honesty of purpose, than on occult combinations without regard to their abstract merits, so long as they can be made instrumental to the promotion of contemplated results.

We cannot close our notice of Lord Elgin's speech, without giving place to some pertinent remarks from the London *Times*, on that portion which refers to the subject of colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament:—

"The question of colonial representation in the British Parliament is one which has occupied some attention in North America, and been advocated in some of the most extraordinary specimens of Transatlantic eloquence that it has yet been our lot to see. The orators generally place themselves on an imaginary pivot, turn their eyes north, south, east, and west, and contemplating the broad lakes and deep rivers of the new continent, draw comparisons extremely unfavourable to the geographical physiognomy of the old. Then they give us imports and exports, population as it is now, as it was 20 years ago, as it will be 20, 50, 100, years hence. They enlarge on the beauty of their women, the sturdy health of their children, the fertility of their soil, and the bracing severity of their climate, and then they triumphantly ask "Is this a country to be denied the rights of citizenship?—is this a people to be treated as an inferior race, and held in vassalage and subjection?" Our answer is short, and we beg for it the attention of Lord Elgin and of any one elsewhere may be disposed to take the claptrap view of the question. We admit the equality of our colonists, but we can admit no more. Let them, by all means, enter our Parliament, and let it be on terms of perfect equality. They claim the right to legislate for us, and, if so, we must also have the right to legislate for them. They claim a voice in taxing us, in contracting loans which we are to pay, and in saddling us with obligations which we are to discharge. All this must, of course, be mutual. If they tax uswe must tax them. If they borrow money on the security of our Ways and Means, we must also have a right to pledge theirs. If they go to participate in imperial powers they must also participate in imperial burdens. The English empire may be looked at in two points of view—either as a Sovereign State surrounded by a number of dependencies, or as a vast confederacy of equal States, each having a voice according to its populations, its wealth, or its territory. In the first case the dependencies may reasonably expect the Sovereign State to bear exclusively the burdens of the government which she retains in her own hands. In the second case it seems just that each confederate should contribute according to his ability, not only to the expense of the Imperial Government, but to the interest of the debt insured for its defence and consolidation. If the colonies are willing to be represented in the Imperial Parliament on these terms, we, on our part, see no objection; but they must look the question fairly in the face, and make up their minds whether the honour they seek be worth the price they will assuredly have to pay for it."

This is a good set-off to the crude and nonsensical ideas that have been indulged, during the last few years, by several of the pigmy sages of British North America, on a most important colonial subject. Colonial representation, however, bears on the very face of it, objections, which might occur to the most superficial observer, independent of the difficulties enumerated by the *Times*. The extent of the British Colonial possessions, the distances at which they are placed, and the dissimilarity and extent of their respective claims compared with those of the mother country, have always seemed to us insuperable impediments of themselves. So long as we give a preference to monarchical institutions, our interests will continue identified with those of Great Britain, and we will seek to perpetuate those terms of connection, which will be found mutually beneficial to the circumstances of both countries. But we think that, on a careful examination, it will appear, that those who have advocated the doctrine of colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament, have been few; and that few composed of aspiring half-fledged statesmen, possessed of more presumption than intelligence. Of course we do not mean to put Lord Elgin in this category; though he has given vent to a notion purely provincial or colonial, and thereby has made himself the representative, presumptively, of an idea which the intelligence and better sense of the people of Canada would indignantly reject. In this respect, then, the mention of the subject of colonial representation, by Lord Elgin, rather redounds to our discredit. We have, it appears, to suffer patiently under the infliction plied to us by the *Times*, in consequence of our late Governor's transgression at Glasgow.

Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic and Civil Wars: with the Supplementary Books attributed to Hirtius; including the Alexandrian, African, and Spanish Wars. Literally translated, with Notes. By W. A. McDevitte, B.A., of Trinity College, Dublin, in conjunction with W. S. Bohn.

A literal translation is that in which the letters of one language are changed to those of another, without altering their powers. This could not have been what the translators of Cæsar's Commentaries intended. Their object, evidently, was to change every Latin word to its corresponding English word. That is, word for word. The book should, therefore, have been designated *a verbal translation*. That such an error as this should

appear in the title-page, is ominous of what may be expected in the body of the work; more particularly when it is considered that the art of translating, verbally, is quite new and little understood. Mr. Bohn says, in his preface:—"Although Cæsar cannot be regarded as a difficult author, the publisher has had no little trouble in procuring a translation to his mind, in consequence of which considerable delay has arisen." This is a candid acknowledgment, but, certainly, little creditable to the Latinity of the present day. Among so many boasted Latin scholars, it turns out that not one can be got who is competent to make a correct verbal translation of the easiest book in the Latin language. Mr. Bohn is, evidently, not satisfied with this production of his own and Mr. McDevitte's joint labour; but he could not do better, and wisely avows that such is the case.

The whole difficulty of studying Latin, or any other language, consists in not adopting the common-sense method which we apply in every other department of learning, and even in the most familiar avocations of every-day life. In anatomy the component parts and members of the body are examined separately. The arteries are distinguished as one part, the veins as another, of the sanguiferous system. No one mistakes these for the heart or the lungs—other parts of the same system. Least of all would a leg and an arm be taken, conjointly, to constitute one member of the body. Even in the simple matter of household bread, we follow the process of analysis. Bread, we say, is a compound of flour, water, and yeast, baked by means of heat. We do not give the name bread to flour alone, nor to the water and yeast without the flour. Why then should we deviate so far, in the interpretation of words, as to violate an observance which, in all other researches may almost be said to be instinctive. For example, the Latin IN, being the fifth word at the beginning of the Commentaries, is translated *into*, that is making a simple word equivalent to a compound. *Into*, besides, is only applicable where there is transition. It is correct to say, *I went into the house, I fell into the pond*, because the predicative conjunctions *went* and *fell* denote transition, and therefore admit of the word of direction *to*, which points to the object *house* or *pond*. But the expression—*divide a thing into three parts*, however common it may be, is incorrect. Not only is the English translation, *into*, therefore, not a verbatim translation of the Latin, but it is also a transgression of a rule for the structure of English itself.

Again, INCOLUNT is represented in English by *inhabit;* INSTITUTIS by *customs;* HUMANITATE by *refinement;* GERUNT by *wage;* OBTINERE by *occupy;* CONTINENTUR by *bounded;* FINIBUS by *territories;* ATTINGIT by *borders;* VERGIT by *stretches*. These occur, all, in the first paragraph; along with numerons errors in regard to the structure of the predicative conjunction; such as *are called*, for APPELLANTUR; *which it has been said that the Gauls occupy*, for QUAM GALLOS OBTINERE DICTUM EST.

A verbatim translation would be desirable for two reasons. First, to convey the exact expression which Cæsar intended; and second, to furnish a convenient key to the Latin reader. Neither of these objects is, however, served by Mr. Bohn's publication. Now, if an easy book, such as the Commentaries, cannot be made to assume a right English garb, and so many errors are committed in the attempt, what must be the nature of the English treatment of the didactic and speculative writings of the old Latin masters? What value can be placed on the English rendering of disputed points of doctrinal theology, of history, and of law? The same remarks apply to other languages; for the fault is not of a special nature, peculiar to local or isolated causes. It is systematic. It is common to the treatment of foreign languages in general, both ancient and modern. So much is this the case, that we think it is scarcely possible to find a complete period, of any translated work, that bears the exact signification of the original.

That words have definite and fixed meanings can only be demonstrated by derivations of their primary roots. A comparison of the cognate words of several languages, in connection with their roots, is the only process by which to determine the general significations; and this once ascertained, the particular applications will cease to appear contradictory. Hoogeveen composed his "Doctrina Particularum Linguæ Græcæ," to fix the significations of what are called Greek particles; and to refute the prevailing opinion entertained by many eminent writers, that these particles are words without meaning. Though he failed in solving the problem of the fixedness of signification, still his original conception is the true one. Bishop Butler has been more successful with the Latin prepositions. Still there is a want of apprehension of the general roots, and a good deal that is arbitrary in his "Praxis," by no means compatible with the idea of definiteness of meaning. The analysis of language has received more attention in Germany than elsewhere, and, during the last forty years, great progress has signalized the labors of a numerous class of German linguists; yet verbatim translations, so far as we have had opportunities of knowing, have not yet been essayed by them. If the Hamiltonian system of teaching is excepted, Mr. Bohn appears to have the credit of being the first in England who has endeavored to produce a complete work of this nature, notwithstanding that he has experienced a want of success.

THE GREEK ALPHABET.

Capital Letters.	Small Letters.	Names.	English Equivalents.
Α	*α*	*Ἄλφα*	a
Β	*β*, *ϐ*	*Βῆτα*	b
Γ	*γ*	*Γάμμα*	g (hard)
Δ	*δ*	*Δέλτα*	d
Ε	*ε*	*Ἔ ψιλόν*	e (short)
Ζ	*ζ*	*Ζῆτα*	z
Η	*η*	*Ἦτα*	e (long)
Θ	*ϑ*, *θ*	*Θῆτα*	th
Ι	*ι*	*Ἰῶτα*	i
Κ	*κ*	*Κάππα*	k
Λ	*λ*	*Λάμϐδα*	l
Μ	*μ*	*Μῦ*	m
Ν	*ν*	*Νῦ*	n
Ξ	*ξ*	*Ξῖ*	x
Ο	*ο*	*Ὄ μικρόν*	o (short)
Π	*π*	*Πῖ*	p
Ρ	*ρ*	*Ῥῶ*	r
Σ	*σ*, *ς*	*Σίγμα*	s
Τ	*τ*	*Ταῦ*	t
Υ	*υ*	*Ὑ ψιλόν*	u
Φ	*φ*	*Φῖ*	ph
Χ	*χ*	*Χῖ*	ch (hard)
Ψ	*ψ*	*Ψῖ*	ps
Ω	*ω*	*Ὦ μέγα*	o (long)